

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by Canon E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, ROWLANDS CASTLE,
HANTS, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XXI

AUGUST, 1930

No. 122

EDITORIAL

PRELUDES TO LAMBETH

THOUGH the Lambeth Conference will almost have concluded its sessions when this issue appears, it may not be amiss to consider some of the immediate preludes to the Conference, and their bearing both on the Conference itself and on the reception of its Report. First among these preludes we set the impressive sermons of the President of the Conference and of the Archbishop of York on the Saturday and Sunday before the sessions began. Both of them in different ways emphasized what we urged in the May number of this Journal should be regarded as the main issue before the Conference—namely, the Church's doctrine of God. We make no excuse for reiterating the point, for it has much to do with the frame of mind in which we approach Lambeth's work. To some, no doubt, any discussion of the doctrine of God will appear to be merely an indulgence in "vague generalities"; and certainly to those whose principal interests lie in issues of ecclesiastical controversy the first item on the Lambeth Agenda will seem an irrelevance, if not a danger. We are convinced, however, that this is not the view of the great bulk of thoughtful Church-people.

Two causes conspire to give to this issue its paramount place. The first is the fact, attested with unanimity by the Jerusalem Conference of 1928 and borne out in the experience of almost any parish priest, that nothing in Christianity is more challenged today throughout the world than its belief in God. The challenge takes the form not so much of hostility as of indifference; and not of indifference only, but of explicit and reasoned indifference. Secularism today has its prophets no less than religion, and a materialistic civilization is now widely preached and accepted as the goal of progress. In such an atmosphere, culture, which is essentially spiritual, tends more and more to go to the wall.

The Church's primary task today is to preserve the inheritance of spiritual culture in a world that is rapidly discarding it; and it can only do this by a massive and imaginative reassertion of what it means to believe in God.

The second cause is not dissimilar. It is that the quality of men's belief in God underlies in the last resort all other issues of religion. All controversies have their roots there, and likewise all are resolved there; and the great spiritual need of our day is for such an opening up of the divine perfections as shall bring confidence and peace to men's souls. And Anglicanism stands firmly here in the mid-stream of the Catholic tradition. For us the dogma of the Incarnation is not simply one way of explaining Christ, but the key to our whole conception of God's nature and of His relation to humanity and to the world. So, too, with the Church and the sacraments: they are not additions to our belief in God, but part and parcel of it, real embodiments of the divine activity made effectual in the historical sphere through the Incarnation. Our faith in God is thus thoroughly synthetic and theological, always seeking to order the impulses of religious experience by the critical reason and claiming that thought only reaches its highest term when it passes into adoration.

One of the most interesting preludes to the Lambeth Conference was the Anglo-Catholic Congress, which gained greatly by the presence and encouragement of a number of overseas Bishops. The strength of the movement behind it was well illustrated in the very large numbers attending it, in the great ability with which it was organized, and in the earnest attention given to a stiff programme of instructions and papers. The High Mass at Stamford Bridge, which at first appeared to many in a provocative light, was seen to be due to cogent practical reasons; and the result was by common consent a singularly impressive service. As to the future of the Congress, two policies are offered for choice. On the one hand are those who agree with Mr. Maurice Child's article in the *Church Times* of July 4, and point to the treatment accorded by Church and State to leaders of the Catholic Movement in the past as justifying and indeed requiring a policy of separatism—not of schism, indeed (though Dr. Langford James* would make for that), but of a markedly separate organization of Catholics within the Church of England. On

* *The Bridge-Church*, published by the Catholic Literature Association of the A.C.C.

the other side stand those who advocate rather a revival of the Tractarian policy of permeation of the whole Church from within, and a deliberate acceptance by the clergy of whatever personal drawbacks fidelity to their principles may entail.

The issue is a complicated one, and it is not enough to say simply that the latter course is obviously the more commendable. None would dispute that; but its practicability has also to be considered. In the first place the Anglo-Catholic Congress has contracted certain obligations which it cannot in honour, or in the interests of the Church, abandon—in particular, the sponsorship of a large number of Ordination candidates. Secondly, while Anglo-Catholics certainly claim that their principles are none other than those of the English Church as a whole, the Congress stimulates and keeps alive a vision and an enthusiasm which might very well be dissipated without it; and it cannot be too often remembered that the Congress movement is very largely a lay movement. Thirdly, it is impossible to be blind to the fact, and all that it implies, of the existence of a "central party," which is sometimes narrow and exclusive. When such a condition obtains, the prophetic element in religion which is so strong in Anglo-Catholicism and so vital to the progress of Christianity is obviously in danger.

Such seem to us to be some of the more important factors in the problem, and its solution is not likely to be discovered in a day. But one or two things may safely be said. The Church of England contains three main groupings which may be broadly defined as Evangelical, Central, and Anglo-Catholic. Any one of these groups may easily become a party through the subordination of its true spiritual ends to organization and the desire for power; and the disease once caught by one group spreads contagiously to the rest. The central group, by the mere fact that it is central, has perhaps more to answer for than any other for the growth of parties; for, being largely official, it is inevitably tempted to claim to be the whole, whereas its true *raison d'être* is to attempt to interpret the other two to one another. The alternative to the degeneration of groups into parties is not the absorption of any one of them into another: it is the maintenance of them as groups, guided along their distinctive lines by authority and encouraged to bring forth their distinctive spiritual fruits.

It is along these lines that the greatest progress has been made within the last generation; and none who read (let us say)

of the way in which the Southwark Diocesan Festival was celebrated last June can have any doubts as to the amazing spiritual power of the Church of England when it is shepherded in this fashion. In such conditions separatism has little to feed upon; if the memories of past persecutions are to be recalled, it will only be in thankfulness at the fruiting of all that the persecuted stood for. At the same time, the situation obviously calls for gifts of a high order, intellectually as well as spiritually, in the higher offices of the Church, and not least for complete impartiality as between different groups in regard to the use of the available material. In this connexion attention may be drawn to an admirable contribution to the *Guardian* of July 11, signed "Geoffrey Warwick"—one of the most penetrating discussions of the Church's administrative efficiency that we have ever read. Three main points are made: first, that the creation of small dioceses does not appear to have produced closer episcopal supervision; secondly, that much ability among the clergy is wasted through the authorities not knowing how to use it; and thirdly, that much more might be done in the way of post-ordination training of the clergy. The whole article deserves attention.

The question of South India has naturally figured largely in the discussions preparatory to Lambeth; and the gradual advance of the problem of Reunion to the fore-front of the Lambeth Agenda is well brought out by Sir Henry Lunn in the current *Review of the Churches*. The change of atmosphere in regard to the matter is most marked, and cannot fail to be a cause of rejoicing. When we pass from the general to the particular, however, the difficulties are still stubborn, and advance must be cautious. Among the issues raised by the South India "Proposals," none is more difficult than the question of Confirmation; and Professor C. H. Turner recently made it the subject of a lecture at King's College, on which Dr. Vernon Bartlet offered some comments in the *Church Times* of June 27. We confess that Dr. Bartlet only confirms us in our view that this is a point on which the Lambeth Conference cannot endorse the South India plan. He is quite entitled to hold his own particular view of what the imposition of hands meant in New Testament days, and to connect this view with the Nonconformist rite of admission to Communion. But this does not touch Professor Turner's main contention that in primitive times Baptism without the laying-on of hands was unknown. But more is involved even than this. It is evident, both from the Acts and from the fact that in the third century

Baptism outside the Church was recognized while Confirmation was not, that Confirmation was regarded as in a special degree *that part of the rite of initiation which symbolized the organic unity of the Church and secured the believer's position within it.* It is, therefore, in a quite pre-eminent sense the sacrament of Reunion. Here each individual member of the Church is brought into direct and palpable contact with the apostolic order in the Church. So far as South India is concerned, we believe that far the best solution would be the restoration of the original twofold rite in the United Church, if it comes into being. If Baptism and Confirmation again become one, there will be a change of custom involved for all those who participate in the scheme; but it will be a change to primitive standards and will involve an enrichment of the meaning of Baptism as well as of Confirmation which will be of great value.

A word may be said in conclusion as to the political situation in which the Lambeth Conference will issue its Report. It is by no means irrelevant. It seems clear that the present tension in political circles cannot last long; and there seems a wide measure of agreement that, in one form or another, the protection of our industries is certain to come. If it does—and we believe it will—it will entail a revolution in the political life of this country, which it is of no avail to disguise. Whereas for centuries spiritual issues, forces, and ideals have occupied a large part of English political life, the change of our fiscal system will carry still further the process by which economic and commercial factors have come to dominate the scene. That is going to make the preservation of any spiritual culture a task of even greater difficulty than at present—as difficult, probably, in this country as it is in America or the Dominions. Such being the case, it is vital that the Lambeth Report should be a rallying centre for faith and for the spiritual life of all who attend to its utterances.

SOME THOUGHTS ON PROCESS AND REALITY

It would be hard to over-rate the importance of the main ideas of Dr. Whitehead's volume of Gifford Lectures, *Process and Reality*, or their interest for divines and metaphysicians. It is not merely that they deserve profound and attentive respect as the personal convictions of an eminent mathematician and man of science who is also an original philosopher; they have an added importance as illustrating the marked change of outlook on ultimate matters which has come over physics in the last thirty years and is equally shown by the recent publications of two such prominent thinkers as Professor Eddington and Sir J. H. Jeans. There are important points on which these two eminent men are in disaccord, and it seems clear that neither of them would simply accept Dr. Whitehead's account of the natural world as it stands. And, no doubt, Dr. Whitehead is himself too true a philosopher to expect, or desire, such a complete coincidence of independent judgments. But on the most vital points of all there is, I think, an agreement fairly indicative of the new and more philosophical temper which is finding its way into physical science, and it is to Dr. Whitehead, as the most consciously philosophic of the three distinguished writers, that we naturally turn for light on the sources and character of this temper. Accordingly, I venture, at my own risk, a few remarks on what I take to be the motive and principles of his philosophy of natural science.

I say "at my own risk," for I am painfully conscious that my interpretation of Dr. Whitehead's central thought has no kind of authority, and may possibly be mistaken. No one but a worker who knows the physical sciences from within could have a right to a confident opinion on the elaborate details of this new "theory of the natural world," and this reason alone would compel me to confine myself to points of general philosophical principle. Even on points of principle Dr. Whitehead is not always easy to interpret. He necessarily expresses himself largely in a novel and difficult language of his own creation, and, to be quite frank, he leans, in his latest works, perhaps a little too much to oracular brevity and obscurity. His deep sayings, like George Fox's, at times "fall brokenly from him." Yet, when I read the new volume in the light of its precursors, especially *Science and the Modern World*, I seem to discern one or two principles of the first importance as the corner-stones of the whole edifice; it is of these that I shall

try to say something in an amateurish way, in the hope that I have not misunderstood seriously.

A reader of such typical nineteenth-century works on natural science as those of Mach or Karl Pearson, if suddenly introduced to Dr. Whitehead's volume, would probably feel that he had been transported back into the mental atmosphere of a far-away age, that he was breathing the air of Plato's *Timæus*, or even of Aristotle's *Physics*. Except in its latest sections, *Process and Reality*, he might say, is very little concerned with what I regard as the proper work of physics, the reduction of the "routine" of recurrent natural processes to mathematical formulation. In the main it is one long discussion of such extra-scientific notions as God, substance, potentiality and act, final causality, contingency, quality. Some of these lie wholly outside the sphere of the physicist and are irrelevant to his special problems; others are mere delusions begotten of ignorance, the very rubbish of the "scholastic" metaphysics against which science was so long ago warned to be on its guard by both Bacon and Newton.

From his own point of view the critic would be entirely right, and it is the very fact that he would be so right which is the proof of the change of outlook characteristic of our present age. No one knows better than Dr. Whitehead himself that there is the closest affinity between his own general attitude towards nature and Plato's, and that if the affinity with Aristotle and St. Thomas is less marked, that is only because neither of them was, like Plato, a mathematician. The root of the matter is that the typical physicists of the last age were consciously or unconsciously "positivists" in their philosophy. Dr. Whitehead is a convinced believer in metaphysics; they, though few of them knew it, were at heart obstinate irrationalists, he is as persistently rationalist as a school-divine. They were specialists with the specialist's habit of "never seeing the wood for the trees"; Dr. Whitehead is of Plato's mind in holding that you will never get clear about the trees unless you grasp the general pattern of the wood.

This explains Dr. Whitehead's preoccupation with those general preliminaries to the natural sciences which physicists of the school of Kirchhoff and Mach relegate to the limbo of a lumber-room for the storage of antiquated mental furniture. Their view was that their business as men of science was simply the discovery of the most manageable set of mathematical formulæ which will serve as a "short-hand" for registering the recurrences observed in natural processes, and the prediction of future recurrences of the same kind. Calculation and prediction, not understanding, it was said, is the one

ideal of natural knowledge. Our task is not to understand the course of events—that is impossible—but to describe it. That the course of events lends itself to full description in the language of mathematics, and that description should enable us to predict, were simply taken for granted as facts about which no question was to be raised. It was assumed, in fact, as obvious that if we only start with the notions of a uniform unbounded, continuous space and time for things to move about in, and an indefinitely large number of eternally unchanging particles of some sort moving about in them, always in accord with two or three ultimate “laws of motion,” the problem of completely describing, and even of predicting, the most varied natural events can be reduced to that of analyzing the motions of a complex into those of its elementary components. The life of a mammal, even perhaps the intellectual and moral history of a man, will have received its complete scientific description when it has been resolved into a complicated dance of millions of particles through space and time. To admit any factor in either which cannot find a place in this scheme is to falsify the description of the facts by the introduction of unmeaning “metaphysical verbiage.” The movements of particles are facts, and whatever is not a motion of a particle is not fact. This is the view of the world of which Dr. Whitehead has said elsewhere that it had just one little defect—that it is flatly incredible.

The reasons why such a view is incredible—so far as they are independent of the discovery of particular facts of which the particular kinematical scheme adopted can give no description—seem to be three. The first and most obvious, that driven home unanswerably thirty years ago by the criticisms of James Ward, is the incurable abstractness of any description permissible under the general scheme. When the procedure of Kant writing the *Critique of Pure Reason*, or even of a cat playing with a mouse, is reduced to a mere dance of particles, manifestly the most salient features of the fact, the deliberate purpose of Kant, the spontaneous initiative of the cat, are simply left out of the description. The scheme has not even a place for the most arresting characteristic of the inanimate world, its riot and wealth of sensible quality. Nothing of all this can appear in a kinematical description. If fact is adequately described by kinematical equations, all that gives the world of life its main interest for us must be dismissed as “fancy,” unauthorized mental addition to the fact. (And of the mind which is supposed to make the addition a doctrine which begins by identifying “real fact” with the movements of a particle can, of course, give no account whatever.) The second source of incredibility,

a legacy from the anti-metaphysical philosophy of Hume, is the doctrine called by Dr. Whitehead the "fallacy of simple location." This is the principle laid down by Hume in the statements that "all our perceptions are *distinct* existences," "our impressions are loose and separate." That is, a genuine fact is always an utterly particular bit of happening confined to just this one "locality" in space and time, and merely juxtaposed with a multitude of other disconnected bits of happening. As the popular expositions of the "theory of relativity" have now taught us all, it seems quite impossible to give any unambiguous meaning to such an absolute and unambiguous location and dating of an event. But the central difficulty of the theory borrowed by nineteenth-century physics from Hume is independent of any particular doctrine of "space-time." It is that the very possibility of scientific description presupposes recurrences, partial repetitions, in the course of events, whereas if all events are strictly particular, there can be no recurrence or repetition. Description is necessarily description by means of "universals," and if a description can ever be true, "universals" must somehow be real; but according to the doctrine of "simple location," a "universal" cannot be anything but a fiction, as Hume very well knew. The third incredibility, a direct consequence of the second, is that if all events are strictly particular, prediction becomes impossible. The triumphs of scientific prediction are an indisputable fact, and according to the very view of science we are considering, intelligent anticipation of the future is the great motive to the construction of the whole mathematical scheme. But if "all our perceptions are distinct existences," my present perception can clearly give me no warrant for any inference beyond itself. Without "induction" the "derivation" of characteristics of the past or the future from observed characteristics of the present, natural science cannot proceed a step, and without a philosophical conception of the nature of an event which rejects the doctrine of "simple location," induction is no more than haphazard guessing. Hume himself, being a sceptic, freely admits this. "The mind," he says, "never perceives any connection between its ideas"; "belief"—and he means our belief in the dogmas of science as well as in those of theology—belongs rather to the "sensitive" than to the rational side of our nature. It is, that is to say, a matter of blind emotional faith.

As Dr. Whitehead has wittily observed, this position satisfied the Royal Society, but disquieted the Church, for the reason that divines are by tradition rationalists, and Fellows of the Royal Society are not. But they certainly ought to have

seen that a view of the nature of the scientific problem which implies that science is the same thing as the *foi du charbonnier* must be gravely wrong somewhere.

The explanation of the singular fact that so many men of science in the last century should have formally professed a philosophical view according to which science is impossible is, of course, quite simple. Like other persons who have inherited a *credo*, they were accustomed to repeat the phrases of their "Belief" without thinking of their meaning. And the reason why they did this was that they were specialists, not accustomed to the long-range "synoptic" view of the philosopher. They were, in fact, too much interested in the trees to worry about the pattern of the wood. Their real interest was in the formulation of the mathematical laws by which this or the other type of recurrent natural process could be calculated and predicted. To the solution of these special problems they brought all the resources of alert and original minds. The general principles inherited from Hume were only dwelt upon in a more perfunctory way when it was felt desirable to put some outsider, divine or metaphysician, and his claims to a knowledge of his own in his proper place of inferiority as a pretender. And for that purpose a good sounding *anathema esto* does not serve any the worse for being repeated without thinking; if it only sounds terrific enough, it matters comparatively little that its meaning will not bear inspection. Of course, if one is really in earnest with rationalism, and so holds that the "course of nature" really has a coherent pattern, the time is bound to come, as it clearly has come in contemporary physics, when this indifference to philosophical principles cannot be kept up. It is then that it becomes imperative to look at the wood as well as at the trees; if science itself is not to be dismissed as a nightmare of misguided imaginations, a revision of first principles becomes absolutely necessary. This is what has happened twice in history in connection with the pure mathematics: once when the penetrating criticisms of Zeno led to the reconstruction of the whole framework of geometrical thought of which the *Elements* of Euclid are the product, and again in the last century when Weierstrass and others set about purging the calculus of the crazy bad logic of its founders. It is happening now to the physical sciences. No one, of course, doubts the genuineness and the importance of their results, but the problem is to know precisely what these results amount to; how our scientific knowledge of nature is related to our extra-scientific knowledge of the world of human activities of all kinds. To offer an answer to this problem is to construct a philosophy of natural science.

It should be clear from what has gone before that any tolerable philosophy of natural science must satisfy three conditions. First, it must recognize to the full the inevitableness of abstraction in all scientific description and the impossibility of reconstituting the full character of a concrete fact by any mere complication of abstractions. Next it must contrive to say what a scientific "fact" is in a way which avoids the "fallacy of simple location." It must show us how we can think of its unit events, whatever they are, in a way which does not isolate each of them in its prison-cell of space-time volume. Third, it must conceive of the world-process made up of the facts in a way which does not make prediction of the unobserved on the basis of the observed a miracle or a "lucky shot"; it must make "induction" intelligible. These are the conditions Dr. Whitehead is trying to satisfy by his "philosophy of organism."

In a way the key to the whole position may be said to be in our hands when once we recognize the artificial and schematic character of the "classical" kinematical scheme. In any actual process we can observe, however small its scale, we always find two characteristics inseparably combined, sameness and novelty. What was here persists, and yet we see the new, that was not here before, in the act of budding out of it, and it is just this "concretion" of the old with the novel that is the innermost character of all "happening." And again, what happens is something strictly individual; there are partial recurrences, but the whole event never repeats itself. In fact, it is only arbitrarily that we can give the name "whole event" to anything short of the "whole of nature at a moment," and that the whole of nature is never the same at two different moments is explicitly asserted by the "principle of Carnot" which is steadily revealing itself as the most significant of all physical principles. Now a philosophy based on mistaking the abstractions of kinematics for actual facts has to sunder the two inseparable characteristics of a real event, the persistence of the old and the emergence of the new. The persistence of the old is accepted as the fact; the appearance of the new is explained away as an illusion of the percipient mind. All that is ever "really" novel is held to be the assumption of different positions in a uniform space by particles which remain eternally self-identical. And it was the dream of the nineteenth-century physicist that we might yet be able to show not only that each of his atoms is always self-identical, but that every one is indistinguishably like every other. It is true that there was the difficulty that the atoms of different chemical elements appeared to have different characteristic weights. But it was

hoped that this difference might be got over by resolving the atom of each chemical element into a complex of a number of "prime" physical atoms, each the exact replica of every other. In that way individuality and novelty would finally be banished from the "real" world.

It is not for me, who am no physicist, to say anything here of the astonishing results reached by the work of Rutherford and others on the constitution of the atom, and the way in which they seem to dispose finally of the anticipation that real happening will ever be resolved into the mere taking up of fresh positions by indistinguishable little bits of stuff. What I would lay stress on is a point of general philosophical principle. No doubt, any analysis of the complex process of happening or becoming which we call *nature* must be given in terms of assumed units, or atoms, but these units, just because what is being analyzed is itself the cosmic "happening," will be units of happening, not units of stuff; atomic events, or, to use a word of Dr. Whitehead's, "occasions," not atomic particles. And being events, our units will have the distinctive character of events, the complication of the persisting old with the emerging new, within themselves as their own fundamental character. Process cannot be analyzed into anything which is not itself process, a consideration fatal to all the philosophies which treat time as an illusion.

With this abandonment of the "fallacy of misplaced concreteness" goes also the abandonment of the other fallacy of "simple location." The unit or "atom" of our cosmology is a unit or atom of process, a "unit event." And events do not go on their own way alongside of, but independent of, each other; they all form together the one web of the complex event which is nature. No part of the web is simply indifferent to any other part. Every event is influenced, positively or negatively, by all the other events of different wheres and different whens. They form its setting, and it is determined in all sorts of ways by its setting. This is what Leibniz meant when he said that every one of his monads was a "mirror," from its own perspective, of the whole universe; what Lotze meant when he said that "things *take note* of one another"; what Francis Bacon meant when he said, in a sentence more than once quoted by Dr. Whitehead with approval, that all things, "though they have not sense, have perception." It is what Dr. Whitehead means by saying that each unit "occasion" is a "prehension," from its own special standpoint, of the whole of nature, that the whole world-process is condensed in, and concerned in, every one of its own details. And it is important to note that the determination is not merely one way. The

future, as well as the past, is present in its own way in the present moment. This is an immediate consequence of the principle that the units into which we can analyze process are themselves units of process. The present event is what it is and no other, not merely because it is coming out of the particular old out of which it is coming, but because the particular new which is coming to be out of it is coming to be out of it. As Leibniz said of his monad, the event is not only laden with the past, but equally pregnant with the future. It is in virtue of this principle that "induction"—the divination of characters of the not now present from those of the present—works both ways; it will reconstitute the eclipse of the remote past as well as anticipate that of the distant future. Induction, in fact, is only possible because no event is *simply* here and now, and nowhere else; there is a real sense in which every event of any place or time pervades all places and all times. Or, to speak with Dr. Whitehead, every "occasion" is a prehension of all occasions.

We see at once that a cosmology conceived on these lines brings us back to recognition of both *efficient* and *final* causality, whereas the philosophy of the nineteenth-century men of science dismissed the latter as anthropomorphic superstition and replaced the former by mere uniform routine sequence of one "disconnected" event on another. Efficient causality comes back with the frank admission of the arbitrariness of the cuts by which we isolate the contents of a region of space and time for our own convenience. Since every unit event is the budding of the novel out of the familiar and the particular way in which the budding is exhibited is influenced by the whole of the familiar "setting," either negatively or positively, the "part" really is *active* in shaping the future; activity could never have been felt to be a paradox but for the prevalence of the "fallacy of simple location." And final causality, in the Aristotelian sense, comes back with the implication of the future in the present. The present is the present it is because it is budding into the novel pattern into which it is budding. The human embryo, for example, develops in the special way in which it does develop, and in no other, precisely because it is *going* to be a *human* baby, and in time a *human* adult, and nothing else. It would be no tolerable account of the human baby to account for it as Aaron did for his molten image by saying that his materials were flung together and "there came out this calf."

And there is a still more important consequence yet to come. It follows from the same principles we have been considering that, in spite of all the scientific determinists, real *contingency*

has to be recognized as a genuine and omnipresent feature in the cosmic process. Each of our events really contributes to the making of itself. This is just because there is a real, not merely an apparent, element of novelty within the event itself. Since an event is the novel "budding out" of the familiar, no event is just the old and familiar over again, and nothing more. It is made what it is not simply by taking up into itself the old which it does take up, but by taking it up into the particular novelty into which it does take it up. No event is simply determined, or made what it is, wholly from without, because every event has something unique in it. It only becomes fully determined by its own occurrence, that is, by its actual contribution of novelty to the pattern of the world. This is what Dr. Whitehead means when he speaks of every event as making a "decision," or says that an "occasion" is "undetermined from without and determined from within." The most important application of the conception is, of course, to the case of our responsible moral "decisions." The paradox of "determinism"—a paradox felt and resented by the ordinary "sensible man," though he commonly cannot put his finger on its root—is just that it insists on maintaining that our line of action is already "determined" while we are still "undecided how to act." An historically minded philosophy like Dr. Whitehead's, which rightly insists that the units into which we can subdivide process must be themselves process, must dismiss the paradox as a mere sophism. It is true, according to such a philosophy, of everything in the universe, and not of intelligent moral agents only, that the thing decides for itself, in the last resort, how it will "prehend" the universe, much as Professor Eddington has said, veiling truth under the language of jest, that the earth "goes where it likes." The difference between the intelligent moral agent and the un-intelligent thing is that the moral agent knows that he is making "decisions," the irresponsible thing makes them without knowing what it is doing. Or, as Leibniz said, moral freedom is "spontaneity with intelligence."

We can see now why Dr. Whitehead should have given the name "philosophy of organism" to his mode of interpreting the natural world. Living organisms, as known to the biologist, are the most striking illustrations—except living human *minds*, that is—of all the principles of which we have been speaking. The life of an organism is itself throughout a perpetual *devenir*, a production of novelty, a making of new responses to the varying situations to which the organism is exposed. The element of spontaneity and initiative to the response has always been noted by the physiological psychologist as *the*

characteristic distinction between the reaction of the lifeless upon its surroundings and the response of the living to stimulus. *Final* causality, again, as we have already observed, is as difficult to expel from the facts of organic life as it is hard to recognize in the inorganic world. (In fact, its prominence in the Aristotelian philosophy is pretty clearly due to the circumstance that Aristotle was himself a biologist and came to philosophy from biology.) And there is no better illustration of what Dr. Whitehead means by the "decision" exercised by an "occasion," and its "prehension" of the universe into novelty, than the typical relation of every organism to its "environment." It *feeds* on the environment; that is, it takes up constituents of it and actually transforms them into constituents of its own substance; it converts them into living tissue. Of course one could illustrate all these points even better from the reactions between a human mind and its "social milieu," but the facts of organic life have the advantage of being more easily accessible to precise scrutiny and description, and less readily distorted by the personal bias of an observer. Biology has thus, thanks to the patient labours of Darwin and his contemporaries, put ready to our hands the very notions we need to work with, if we are to produce an interpretation of the natural world which a philosopher—that is, a man who is seriously determined to think consistently—will not be driven to pronounce incredible. The task of the philosopher of nature is to detect in the inorganic world the main features of the pattern already manifest in the organic.

A final and most momentous step towards formulating these principles still remains to be taken. All process is a "concretion" of the already produced into novelty, and the novelty is *really* novel. This means, of course, that Aristotle's great formula that becoming or process is the actualization of potentialities is exactly true, and therefore that the real and the actual are not to be identified. Beyond the actual there is always a range of real possibilities which are in course of conversion into actuality. The schoolboy of to-day will be the adult citizen of ten years hence. But it would not be the full truth of the matter to say only that there is a schoolboy now and there will be a grown man ten years hence. We have not stated the whole truth unless we add that the schoolboy is *now* "becoming" the man he will be. Unless we insist on that, the very fact of "becoming" slips through our fingers in the attempt to describe it, just as motion does if we imagine that it means only being first at one place and then at another.

Now a real possibility, while it remains a possibility, differs at once from an impossibility, which never is nor can be actual-

ized, and from the already actualized. That Julius Cæsar should turn away from the Rubicon when he reached it was no impossibility, yet the possibility never was, and never will be, actualized.

What is actualized in the course of history is a selection from a wider system of real possibilities. And this means the dependence of history on a twofold "decision," the "decision" which makes the difference between the possible and the impossible, and the "decision" in virtue of which one possibility is actualized to the exclusion of its contrary. Clearly, it is only the second of these "decisions" in which the "actual occasion," the event which is coming to be, is playing a part. Events are not themselves the creators of the scheme of relevant possibilities under which they emerge into actuality. It is for Cæsar to "decide" whether he will cross the Rubicon or will not, but the relevancy of just this particular alternative to the "decision" Cæsar has to make is a condition of the decision. Real possibilities, in fact, are an organized and articulated system of "eternal objects." Every "event" is the embodiment in the historical process of a selection from these "objects," which are, in fact, the Platonic *idéai*. It is just because *they* are an articulated system that the whole body of real possibilities is involved, in varying degrees of "relevancy," in each of the "decisions" which constitute actual historical events. If an event were *merely* a particular "occurrence," Hume would be right; there would then be no "connection" between events but only spatial and temporal juxtaposition, and the induction which is the foundation of science would be, as Hume thought it was, the mere expression of a logically unjustifiable expectation. Science would be no more than the record of the baseless anticipations of mankind, and its success would be a standing "miracle." Hume is in fact wrong, and events are not merely juxtaposed but connected in virtue of the systematic interconnection of the "universals," "Platonic *ideas*," or "real possibilities" which are "situated" in them. (To take a pair of elementary examples: the members of my body are not merely contiguous with one another, they are connected by the æsthetic pattern of the human "type" which pervades them; the successive sentences and clauses of the paragraph I am now writing are not merely a sequence of printed symbols, but are, or ought to be, connected by constituting the expression of a logically articulated thought.)

But if real possibilities thus form a system with a definite structure—and if they do not, the possible is no longer distinguishable from the impossible, both reducing alike to the unactualized—we have further to recognize the great principle

that definite possibility itself is founded on an antecedent actuality. As Aristotle said, "the potential is only actualized by the agency of the already actual." Or, to express the same thought in the language of Lotze, the one eminent philosopher whose name, oddly enough, I seem never to have seen mentioned in Dr. Whitehead's writings, it is only because there is an ultimate actual reality which has the character it has, that the course of history at any moment presents us with just such and such real possibilities. Behind the whole of what may be and what may not be, there must be, as the source of the distinction, that which does not happen, but eternally and once for all is. The source of the open possibilities without which there would be no becoming must be the eternal "decision" of God. Dr. Whitehead is, in fact, "doing right," I do not know whether consciously or not, to two great philosophic positions. He is reasserting the doctrine of Augustine and Christianized Platonism in general, that the "archetypal ideas" of creation are eternally contained in the "Word" which was in the beginning with God, and is God. He is also vindicating against the more sceptical Kant of the *Critique of Pure Reason* the earlier and more Leibnizian Kant who had made the necessity for the distinction between real possibility and impossibility the foundation of the "only possible proof of the existence of God."

If Dr. Whitehead's line of argument is sound, as I confess it seems to me that it is, the conception of God as the ultimate source of the historical world of becoming thus comes back into cosmology, not as a permitted hypothetical interpretation of the facts which reason can do nothing either to substantiate or to discredit, but as the absolutely necessary foundation for the very distinction between fact and unfact. And we see also why appeal to any one particular class of natural facts is a dangerous basis for a theistic argument, and why it is true that it is irrelevant and improper to fall back on God as the explanation of any special natural fact. The reason is that the eternal "decision" of God lies behind every fact. If, *per impossibile*, there could be any single fact which does not involve this "decision," there is no reason why it should be involved by any other fact. The cosmologist does not, for example, need to bring in God to set the solar system moving by giving it an initial push or spin; where he does find the conception of God indispensable is when he asks himself why there should be anything at all, and not just nothing.

I am far from sure how far Dr. Whitehead's account of God, as it stands, will satisfy the theological reader. For one thing, the nature of the argument of *Process and Reality* involves con-

centration on the special question of the significance of the thought of God as a *cosmological* principle of explanation. But God, to the Christian, and to the Theist generally, is something much more than a principle of explanation; God is also the wholly adorable, the aim and goal of all endeavour, the Omega of creation as well as its Alpha, and no one knows this better than Dr. Whitehead himself, as one can see from his essay on *The Making of Religion*, as well as from the incidental passages in *Process and Reality* itself where God is dwelt on as the spring of spiritual "refreshment." An account of what we mean by God which is unexceptional, so long as we are concerned merely with the question what God must be to be the source of all possibilities and all facts, may prove quite inadequate when we go on to consider what God must be to be the inspiration and sustainer of the "life hid with Christ in God." And I do not feel sure that incidentally Dr. Whitehead has not committed himself to some positions in his utterances about God which need serious reconsideration in view of the fact that God is as much the King of Saints as the "Source of all being, throned afar." I feel this particularly in connection with two features of his treatment, the series of theses enunciated at the end of the volume (p. 492) in which the world is declared to be necessary to God, to transcend God, and to be in some sort creative of God, and the distinction made from the start between *creativity* and God, who is declared Himself to be a "creature," though an eternal creature and the "primordial" concretion of creativity. I cannot help thinking that I trace here uncriticized prepossessions, due to the influence of Spinoza in the one case and Bergson in the other, which would not stand close examination. In fact, I feel for my own part that both influences, especially that of Bergson, are leading Dr. Whitehead into unconscious tampering with his own sound principle that all possibility is founded on actuality. In particular, the attempt to get back somehow behind the concreteness of God to an *élan vital* of which the concreteness is to be a product really amounts to a surrender of the principle itself. I honestly think Dr. Whitehead is here himself falling a victim at the outset to the "fallacy of misplaced concreteness." And I think the influence of Spinoza intellectually always a dangerous one for a metaphysician. A natural admiration for Spinoza's character seems to me regularly to blind most students to the hopeless incoherence of his thinking. "Incoherence," says Dr. Whitehead himself, who goes on to point his criticism against Descartes, "is the arbitrary disconnection of first principles." Now I should be tempted to say that the most glaring example of this disconnection in modern philosophy, and one which brings

incoherence into every discussion it affects, is Spinoza's intercalation of his "attributes" between "substance" and its "modes," though this very doctrine of the "parallel" attributes is the special Spinozistic thesis which has left the deepest mark on Dr. Whitehead's own exposition of the facts of the natural world. I seriously believe that Dr. Whitehead's work would be even better than it is if it were influenced a little more by St. Thomas and a little less by Spinoza.

A. E. TAYLOR.

"BUCHMANISM"

THE citizens of the U.S.A. are the world's greatest showmen. They have an uncanny flair for unearthing discarded toys, refurbishing them and presenting them to our fascinated gaze with all, and more than all, their old attractiveness. It is obvious that when this talent for revivification is applied to serious things it must be a power of very great importance, and especially will this be so when it is concerned with an historical religion. St. Paul once compared himself to something very like a showman, but that was in the days before the gospel had had time to grow old, and the good news, which was still news, had only to be placarded far and wide. After nineteen centuries of iteration the man who can make the gospel seem news again, who can "restore commonplace truth to its first uncommon lustre," is a man indeed. To an increasing number of people on both sides of the Atlantic, and indeed throughout the world, such a man appears to be the American Lutheran minister, the Reverend Frank N. D. Buchman, D.D.

This remarkable person is alleged by his followers to possess no particular intellectual gifts or social graces. Photographs lend verisimilitude to this assertion. He is indeed at that awkward age, the fifties, having been born (in Pennsburg, Pa.) on June 4, 1878. He was not remarkable in his upbringing. He received his training for the ministry both in America and Westminster College, Cambridge, and was ordained in 1902. Perhaps the first odd thing about him was that, although he chose a difficult part of Philadelphia for the scene of his early ministerial labours and built up the first Lutheran hospice in America, he does not seem to have got on well with his ecclesiastical superiors. "I felt that I could justly accuse those men of hard-heartedness, high-handedness, bigotry. They had always seemed to be opposing me—opposing my work." He spent a

year travelling in the East and then came in 1908 to attend the Keswick convention. Here in true Franciscan fashion occurred the event that was to change his life.

He had wandered into a little country church where he found a woman addressing a congregation of seventeen persons on the subject of the Cross. He was himself feeling profoundly wretched. There was the standing feud with his leaders, but also a certain dissatisfaction with his own work. He had been unable to impart into his teaching any vitality, and he knew that the real mischief lay in himself. "Three things were in my blood: selfishness, pride, ill-will; I could not get rid of them; while they were there I knew that the better part of me could not function as it ought. Think of it: selfishness, pride, ill-will; and I called myself a Christian, tried to make others Christians!" Then with the words of the preacher there dawned upon his mind, but separated from him by a yawning gulf, a vision of the Crucified, with face reflecting infinite sorrow. Before this vision selfishness, pride, and ill-will vanished. He surrendered to its appeal; a current seemed to vibrate within him; the gulf was passed and he was at the foot of the Cross.

It is significant for the later history of the movement that the first effect of this experience was that Buchman wrote to the six men in America against whom he had borne resentment asking their pardon and craving their friendship, putting at the head of each letter the first verse of the hymn, "When I survey the wondrous Cross." To these letters he received not a single reply. Opportunity for efforts to make men realize the Cross as he had done came in 1909, when Dr. John R. Mott sent him to undertake the charge of the Y.M.C.A. in an American state university. Here his first disciple was a popular graduate who professed an airy Confucianism and whom he had challenged to convert with his philosophy a notorious bootlegger, the source of most of the evil in the university. After the inevitable failure they tried together upon the sinner, but this time with the simple teaching of the Cross of Christ, and now they gained a conspicuous success. The third and greatest conquest was that of the College Dean, a hardened official who was amazed at a religion which could defeat the liquor traffic and make college discipline unnecessary; amazement deepened into reverence and reverence into conviction. Thus he completed the curiously assorted trio who were for the next seven years Buchman's staunchest supporters in that campaign of "personal evangelism" which changed the face of religion in the whole university. Then in 1916 "F. B.," as he is affectionately styled, was appointed Extension Lecturer at Hartford Theological Seminary, where he had an invaluable opportunity of

teaching his methods to the ministers of the future. But this period was broken by much foreign travel, and in 1921 he left Hartford to devote himself entirely to the itinerant work.

Thus far about Buchman: what now about "Buchmanism"? It describes itself as a Christian Fellowship, as indeed a First-Century Christian Fellowship. But that is to enrich the first century with yet another type of Christianity in addition to the many that Canon Streeter has already found for us in that much maligned period. "Buchmanites," however, would be supremely indifferent to a charge of anachronism. They are content to disregard both history and theology (although there are historians and theologians among them); their mutual bond, they say, is not creed but Christ; they know one thing only—Christ and Him crucified, and that not as a matter of history but as a present reality. This is to them the fundamental thing, and anyone who misses it will fail to grasp the significance of the whole movement. Christ as a person is actually present to guide and order the life of the believer. He may send one to the ends of the earth, command one suddenly to surrender one's employment, bid one address a total stranger, and He must be at all costs obeyed. To mere common sense the result of this appears sometimes noble, sometimes doubtful, sometimes frankly ludicrous. If it is asked why there are so many other Christian people who do not possess this intense personal knowledge of Christ and this immediate awareness of His will, the answer given is that the failure is due to Sin. There is no mincing matters about that; and there are numerous recorded instances of Dr. Buchman's marvellous success with individuals through bluntly revealing to them the actual sin in their own life. This, be it noted, is sin interpreted as widely as in the gospels. One hears more of selfishness, pride, ill-will than of anything else, and the charge that "Buchmanism" is unduly concerned with sexual matters had better be dismissed as the merest nonsense.

The Fellowship consists of those who have had conscious personal experience of Christ; it is a "gathered church" consisting of individuals of all denominations. It has nothing to do with crowds or masses, but sets itself to deal with individuals, mostly young. Hitherto its members have been drawn chiefly from the universities. Early in the history of the movement it became evident that "the most neglected and ill-handled field of spiritual endeavour in the English-speaking world was to be found in the colleges and universities of Britain and America," though in the minds of some the theological colleges appeared to run the universities a good second. In these circles conversions were sought not by preaching but through the influence exerted by one individual upon another.

Of these individuals "groups" were formed, and it is these "groups" that are the basis of the Fellowship. Their meetings are not services for common worship—which would be difficult where so many variations of faith and practice are represented—but for the pooling of experiences, "sharing" as it is called. In this there is nothing new except the name; it is the old testimony meeting with which Keswick familiarized us, but less terrifying and formal, and with an atmosphere of such camaraderie that even the freshmen enjoy the novel delight of calling dons by their Christian name. To share one's religious experiences is regarded as a bounden duty, and it is undoubtedly this that preserves the vitality of the movement. Whether in the presence of the individual whom one has been guided to tackle, or in the group itself, one must speak out what God has whispered in the ear. "The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord," and it is certain that many of the Lord's candles have been lighted by this method of handing on the flame.

Another method of keeping the Fellowship alive and attracting newcomers is that of the house-party. Here again we perceive the influence of Keswick, for were not Oxford and Cambridge house-parties regular features of that convention? But "Buchmanism" wears its rue with a difference. It commandeers a hotel or convenient house for a Sunday, or weekend, or a longer period, and invites to it a heterogeneous collection of people who will devote their time entirely to the things of the Spirit. The result is a "retreat" without the silence and without the guidance of a conductor. The first such party was held in mid-China in 1918, when "F. B." was on his visit there and collected round him a mixed company of Western and Oriental religious leaders. The first party held in this country was at Cambridge in 1921. The novelist Harold Begbie was present and has recorded his impressions in his book *Life Changers*. One may suspect that the novelist has "written up" his material a little; nevertheless the book is not uncritical, and yet one may obtain from it a better notion of the romance behind the movement than from any other written source. In recent years Wallingford, because of its nearness to Oxford, has become the favourite spot for the holding of such house-parties.

While these are the efforts made along the lines of Fellowship, the struggle to awaken and preserve the intense personal faith of the individual continues, and it is interesting to note that it develops along the lines laid down by age-long Christian experience. It is a real discipline that compels young men to get up early every morning for what they call their "quiet time." This appears to be American for "meditation." A passage of Scripture is read, thought about and prayed over, and then there

is a quiet waiting upon God to see what message He will speak in the listening ear. Careful note is made of the results, and what God has given is "shared" with the group which meets later in the day. Thus the note of the personal religion engendered by the Fellowship is "unflinching devotion to the particular will of God recorded through prayer, expectant listening, and active witness with others."

Such is the movement which, as far as this country is concerned, has its centre for the moment at Oxford. Here it has affected perhaps two hundred undergraduates of whom only a small minority are women. From this university went the "team" of seven to South Africa in 1928, which was so warmly welcomed by the Bishop of Bloemfontein and enjoyed so striking a success. From here, too, went the mission to a Congregational church at Dulwich at the end of 1929, and from here the movement descended upon Edinburgh in the present year, using the episcopal cathedral as its centre. At Cambridge it does not appear to have taken so strong a hold, but recently one well-known member of the Fellowship has become a college chaplain there, and we may expect to hear of its influence in that university in the future.

What are we to think of it? In Oxford it met its only opposition from the extreme Protestant quarter. Chaplains of the Catholic type met and decided that they could not conscientiously oppose it. The natural question was, how would it affect the college chapels? It has generally been the characteristic of pietistic movements to decry the services of institutional religion, and some chaplains could point out instances where individuals affected by the "groups" had become indifferent to their college chapel. But it can safely be affirmed that such individuals were stultifying the avowed aim of the Fellowship, which is emphatically not to form a sect but to vitalize religion within the "churches." The present writer asserts without hesitation that in his own observation the result has been to make undergraduates not less but more assiduous in their attendance at chapel and more frequent in their communions. That there are dangers goes without saying, although they are not those upon which popular imagination, always prone to impute the worst, has fastened. The impulse to share experiences leads some to speak who have nothing to say, and priggishness and hypocrisy may follow upon the genuineness of the "first, fine, careless rapture." It is also pathetic that so often during the "sharing" a state of soul should be revealed which cries aloud for the advice of a wise and sympathetic director and the advice be lacking. Indeed, it may be doubted whether people will long continue satisfied to practise such a

kind of *exomologesis* without enjoying its complement of counsel and absolution. Churchmen at least may be forgiven for believing that the tried system of Catholic Christianity is likely to be the residuary legatee of all vital Christian experience, and may rejoice that at least the first step has been taken when Christ has become a personal reality to the soul.

A tremendous asset of the movement is the strong sense of comradeship it has been able to evoke within the sphere of intense religious feeling. Those of us who have endeavoured in more stereotyped fashion to attain the same end know how difficult it is to elicit this feeling within the stiff circles of moderate Churchmanship. What a challenge, then, to us is this manly and passionate comradeship in devotion to the Christ! Some of us can remember what it meant to us in our own timid youth to find in Oxford men of our own age and tastes who were so on fire with their religion that they were not afraid or ashamed to talk about it. We are not likely to begrudge to the present generation the joy and inspiration of such ennobling friendships.

What will be the future of the movement it is unsafe to prophesy. Possibly it has no future outside the universities. They have been the main point of attack, and they provide the kind of atmosphere in which such a movement can naturally flourish. Here there is already a fellowship of people with widely divergent views; here there is also a sufficiency of the kind of people who can afford to go off to house-parties and form "teams" to visit distant towns and countries. In the parishes life runs in narrower grooves, and parties are more sharply divided. Such inspiration as the movement can bring will probably find its course within the denominations and will not help to fuse them. But in these days who can tell? Why should not the Fellowship become a religious Rotarian movement? In our own Church it may very possibly most affect the neo-Evangelicals. If that comes to pass it will give them the vital energy that they seem to need. It is definitely mystical in tendency; it has none of the vague sentimentalism that characterizes this school of thought in the metropolis, nor the pale ethicism that does duty for it in the universities. "Buchmanism," with its passionate devotion and its intense solidarity, might go far towards making Evangelicism the strongest religious force in the Church of the next generation. And that would be no light thing to have accomplished, even for an American Lutheran.

J. W. C. WAND.

THOMAS BRAY, 1656-1730

DR BRAY was born in 1656, founded the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G., has had his memory perpetuated in the Bray Libraries for the clergy, and is fitly given a brief mention in our Church Histories. This is the extent of the knowledge of most of us. But the two hundredth anniversary of his death commemorated by an article in *The Times* last February, suggests that a little more information would be welcome. What follows is a summary, with quotations, of *Publick Spirit, illustrated in the Life and Designs of the Reverend Thomas Bray, D.D., late minister of St Botolph without Aldgate*, a little book published in 1746 by "J. Brotherton, at the Bible, next Tom's Coffee-House in Cornhill."

Thomas Bray was born at Marton, in Shropshire, in 1656; "his Parents were Persons of good Reputation, Inhabitants of that Place; his Infancy discovering promising Parts, he was early sent to the School at *Oswestry*, in the same County, where many Gentlemen's Sons had then their Education." Thence he went to Hart-Hall in Oxford, where he did well. However, "labouring under the common Disadvantages of a narrow Fortune, his Circumstances not permitting a longer residence at *Oxford*, he left the University soon after he had commenced Bachelor of Arts." He was ordained, his first parish being near Bridgnorth; but presently he became chaplain to Sir Thomas Price of Park-Hall in Warwickshire. He began to attract notice by an Assize Sermon at Warwick, and in 1690, Mr. Digby Bull, Rector of Sheldon (near Birmingham), refusing to take the oaths, Lord Digby presented him to that living, which he held till just before he died. (The S.P.C.K. in recent years has published its books of general, as distinct from religious, literature with the imprint "The Sheldon Press," thus commemorating the home of its founder).

He always esteem'd it not the least honour and happiness of his life, the being preferred by such a Patron as my Lord *Digby*, who was never determin'd by any other Consideration in the Disposal of Presentations, than of chusing the most useful Persons to serve in the Church . . . an Observation not a little to Mr *Bray's* Credit, as well as to the honour of my Lord *Digby*.

As Rector of Sheldon he composed his Catechetical Lectures, the first impression of which was 3000 copies. "The Publication of these Lectures, the first Fruits of his Piety and Learning, drew him out of his rural Privacy to *London*, and introduced him to a more conspicuous and remarkable Scene of Action."

In all, by two editions, he cleared over £700—a remarkable sum in view of the small reading public of those days and the nature of the subject.

In 1695 the Province of Maryland, which had shortly before divided its territory into parishes, asked the Bishop of London to appoint a clergyman to superintend the Church and preside over the other clergy, and petitioned William and Mary “to annex, for ever, the judicial Office of Commissary, before in the Disposal of the Governor, to that which is purely Ecclesiastical.” The Bishop offered the position to Mr Bray, representing the emoluments to be £400 a year. Mr Bray disregarded the profits that would have accrued from the continuing of his Lectures and accepted the post subject to the backing of his plans by the Bishops, before whom he laid the following considerations:

That none but the poorer sort of clergy cou’d be persuaded to leave their Friends and change their Native Country for one so remote;—That such Persons could not be able sufficiently to supply themselves with Books;—That without a competent Provision of Books, they cou’d not answer the Design of their ministry;—That a Library would be the best Encouragement to studious and sober Men to undertake the Service.

If the Bishops would help in a scheme of Parochial Libraries he would accept the offer. The plan was favourably received and “he set himself with all possible Application to provide Missionaries, and to furnish them with Libraries, intending, as soon as he shou’d have sent both, to follow after them himself.” Apart from Consecration, he was to be what we understand by a Missionary Bishop. Some delay was caused by a flaw in the proposed Bill for establishing the Church in Maryland, which contained a clause, not covered by the title, for making *Magna Carta* the law of the province. Meanwhile Thomas Bray was busy with his Libraries scheme and with finding missionaries for America generally. Thus he sent Mr Clayton to Philadelphia, where Anglicans were under 50 in number, but in two years’ time rose to 700; and Mr Marshall to Charles Town in Carolina. Here

not only was a Church built, but also purely out of respect to Mr Marshall, a new Brick House for his better Accommodation, a fine Plantation, with a perpetual Stock of two Negroe Servants and two Cows, with 150*l.* a Year were settled on them and their Successors for ever.

We may now speak of Dr Bray, for,

upon the repeated Instances of the Governor and some of the Country, Mr Bray was at the Charge of taking the Degree of

Doctor of Divinity, which Degree, tho' it might be thought to be of some Use, with respect to his having a better regard paid to the Church, as well as himself, in *Mary land*, did, however, then but ill comport with his Circumstances.

Dr Bray tried hard to get an endowment for his missionary work. A Committee of the House of Commons recommended that lands given to superstitious uses might be devoted to that purpose, namely "a fourth Part of all that should be discovered, after one Moiety to the Discoverer." "But the Bill was never suffer'd to be reported." An attempt to get a grant out of certain arrears of taxes also failed.

All Designs failing of getting a publick Fund for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, he thereupon form'd a Design, whereof he then drew the Plan, of having a Protestant Congregation, *pro Fide propaganda*, by Charter from the King. But Things did not seem ripe enough to encourage him to proceed at that Time in the Attempt, and so he laid it aside, till a more favourable Juncture should occur. However, to prepare the Way for such Charter-Society, he soon after endeavoured to form a Voluntary Society . . . to propagate Christian knowledge, as well at home and abroad. . . . Nor was it long before he found some worthy Persons ready to found this Voluntary Society.

Here, then, we have the first sketch of S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. S.P.C.K. is the voluntary society; with all possible deference to the Episcopate, it yet maintains its freedom of action; it has never been incorporated. S.P.G., by its founder's design, is a Protestant Congregation *pro fide propaganda*. Dr Bray began his home work simultaneously with the foreign work. "The good man's Inducement to it, as he has been heard to declare, was" (1) he had never himself had enough money to buy books and "he became thereby more Sensible of the Wants of his Brethren"; (2) he was able to answer more effectively the objection "that we had poor Cures and poor Parsons enough in England, and that Charity should begin at Home." "The Doctor cou'd not imagine what could be better pursued, in order to keep the Country Clergy to their Rule, and close to their Duty, and thereby to advance their Character and Reputation, and to create a due Veneration towards them."

The Libraries were on a Ruridecanal basis. The clergy were to meet in a central place, and study, among other things, their Ordination Vows, and the Articles, Rubrics and Canons of the Church. He had a further purpose in view,

which was to reduce into Practice, and to restore more and more, by Degrees, the antient Use of Rural Deans, and the Jurisdiction pertaining to their respective Deaneries; whereby, as an excellent Discipline was formerly maintain'd in our Church, so it might be

again, in a good measure reviv'd; in such a manner, at least, as not to give the Occasion we now have, every *Ash-Wednesday*, to lament its Loss or Decay among us.

How far this "Way of Renewal" was a spiritual force it would be hard to say. At least it is a proof of the earnestness and good sense of the times. But the Library Scheme took root very soon in most dioceses.

At last on December 16, 1699, he sailed for Maryland, borrowing money and selling his personal belongings to pay his passage. He arrived on March 12 and set to work to get the delayed Bill for establishing the Church through the Assembly. With some difficulty, owing to "the Insinuations of the *Quakers* and *Papists* (no Unnatural Coalition)," he succeeded. On May 22, 1704, he held a general visitation of the clergy of the province at Annapolis. The Assembly and the clergy agreed in wishing him to return home and secure the Royal Assent to the Bill of Establishment, which was by no means certain.

Back in London, Dr Bray had to face great opposition from influential Quakers.

But the Doctor refuted their specious Objections by unanswerable Reasons, and placed the Affair in such an advantageous Light, that his majesty decided, without any Appearance of Hesitation, in the Church's Favour, and gave the Royal Assent in these remarkable Words: *Have the Quakers the benefit of a Toleration? Let the Establish'd Church have an Establish'd Maintenance.*

We hasten through the concluding years of this useful life. In 1706 Dr Bray accepted the Rectory of St Botolph Without. In 1712 he published his *Martyrology*, or *Papal Usurpation*, a successor to which book was never completed. However, his materials were bequeathed to Sion College. He began training young clergymen to be missionaries to the negroes on the Plantations. Among other books, he published his *Directorium Missionarium* in 1726, and reprinted Erasmus's *Ecclesiastes*, which he particularly admired. In 1727 he began visiting Whitechapel prison. The conditions were appalling: he raised funds to supply the prisoners with bread, beef, and broth on Sundays; arranged for spiritual ministrations, which were given by his missionaries in training, "to inure them to the most distasteful Parts of their Office"; and made known "the Sore . . . and . . . Inhumanity . . . which, afterwards some worthy Patriots of the *House of Commons*, took so much Pains to enquire into and redress."

"Being now far advanced in Years, and continually reminded of his approaching Change, by the Imbecility and Decays of old Age," he took steps to increase the number of the Associates

(of Dr Bray's Libraries), enlisting the services of General Oglethorpe, the famous Governor of Georgia. A plan for emigrating young people in workhouses to America seems to have failed. But Dr Bray took the leading part in establishing the Society for Reformation of Manners, in setting up Charity Schools, and in the affairs of the Society for the Relief of Poor Proselytes. "Most of the Religious Societies in London owe grateful Acknowledgments to his memory, and are in a great measure formed on the Plans he projected."

At this point the narrator lets himself go and ends on a high resounding Eighteenth Century note.

And now the Doctor having happily lodged his principal Designs in the Hands of able Managers, being on the Verge of the Grave, he could not but review his Undertakings with Complacency, and thank the good Providence of God, which appeared, to lay such Trains for their Advancement. His Conscience crown'd him with a secret Applause, which was an inexhaustible Source of comfortable Reflections and joyful Presages in his last Minutes.

It is easy to smile and to recall the pompous epitaphs on the tombs of bewigged divines. But the words at least prove to a less unsophisticated generation that Thomas Bray believed that God "is, and that He is a rewarder of them that seek Him." Without this two-fold belief we fight a losing battle against the insurgent forces of "humanism." Human nature needs an adequate motive to sustain it in a life-long struggle. We need not be ashamed of "joyful presages" of a heavenly reward, for the reward can only be spiritual. Those who affect to despise it are alien in spirit to the heroes of faith who answered the roll call in the eleventh chapter of the Hebrews, and, like Moses, "looked unto the recompense of reward."

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE INFLUENCE AND WORK OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

It is the fashion today to say bitter things about the non-Christian character of modern England.

We are told that it is ridiculous to speak of "Christian England." We are assured, with some truculence, that our civilization is pagan, and that it is futile to regard it as anything else.

Assertions of this kind seem to take no account of the Christian threads so thickly woven into the warp and the woof of our national life. We are wont to say that modern England

is not the product of sudden ebullitions, of revolutions and counter revolutions, but that it has been gradually evolved. We are told that our genius is to pass gradually to new developments and fresh positions. We are never sudden, but always progressive. One consequence of this has been that for some fourteen hundred years Christian principles and ideals have never been eliminated from our institutions, our moral code, our social conduct, our charities, and, certainly, also our legislation. If we have striven forward at all, it has been always towards a relation to one another which approximates more clearly to the worth of the individual personality, and to that charity, mercy, and consideration for others which is of the very essence of Christianity.

That the movement has often been slow and partial and, at times, extraordinarily stupid, one would not deny, but no student of social life in England would maintain that our island story has been continuously stagnant. There have been, alas! "slow watches of the night," but they have been followed by brighter dawns in which we have picked up the trail again, and in our blundering manner gone forward.

Mr. Hamer Lewis, writing in the *Evening Standard* last month, said, "Human aspirations are the result of religious urge."

As a nation we have developed increasingly the aspiration that everyone in the country should have politically, economically and socially a "square deal."

There are, of course, and always have been, "many adversaries," but the aspirants have been generally sufficient in number and quality to keep us moving onward towards their objective. Many of them, perhaps most of them, have shown patently "the religious urge," and the religion has been Christianity. Despite all its defects, its blots, and even its serious delinquencies, our civilization in its main principles is the outcome of the persistent influence of the Christian Church upon our national character.

As Bishop Talbot once said, "diluted Christianity permeates the community."

There are a very large number of people whose hearts burn within them because of the inequalities of opportunity, and the social wrongs which cry to Heaven for redress, and which seem to be ignored, if not maintained, by many otherwise respectable people. These distressed ones forget the great achievements for England of Christianity, because their minds are completely occupied with resentment that Christian idealism has not eliminated all the social ills which deficiency in Christian conduct on the part of individuals, or groups of individuals, has thrown up either in their selfishness or their obtuseness.

Surely life would be intolerable for everybody in this overpopulated, scientifically informed, and commercially organized island, were it not for a general prevalence of the Christian ethic. But by many the Church is condemned because it has failed completely to control and transmute every department and development of our social relations, as the generations hurry past, one after another, each one more numerous than the last, and consequently more pressed by economic considerations, and more absorbed in materialistic activities.

It is well to realize the difficulties which beset a Church originally organized on a population basis of four or five million, mainly agriculturists, when it seeks to bring Christian graces and principles into the lives of some thirty millions, whose preoccupations are multiform, and infinitely more exacting than under the pre-industrial conditions of English life.

There are not a few who will, in their bitterness, declare that they have no use for the Church or the Christian religion, while the very cause of their bitterness, the unchristian character of so much in modern life, bears witness to the strands of Christianity woven into their own mentality.

To write such people off as non-practising Christians, or not Christians at all, is to do neither them nor the Christian faith, in its relation to the national life, justice.

One of the misapprehensions under which the Church has long laboured is that the hall-mark of a genuine Christianity is attendance at church: a mistake as egregious as the not uncommon impression that admiration for the Sermon on the Mount justifies a man in calling himself a Christian.

I believe it is true to say that the essential objectives and ideals of the Christian Church are constantly forwarded, by many who do not "profess and call themselves Christians," but whose outlook is leavened by Christianity, however unconsciously Christian ideals and sentiments percolated into their character, either by direct early training or by the age-long Christian atmosphere in which as Englishmen they have grown up.

One supposes that Christ would claim such people as on His side, though they hold of little account the service for the nation of His Church, a service which has done much to give them the hunger which they themselves have for social betterment.

But in addition to the untraceable influence of the Church through the ages in forming the character and ideals of good men and women who, professedly, are not Christian believers, there is a vaster field of direct influence maintained by the Church, often under great difficulties. For this no credit is given, simply because it is not realized by those whose train-

ing, occupation, or mode of life, makes their knowledge of the Church's real impact defective, and often non-existent.

Those who have no personal contact with Church life acquire their ideas about it from the Press and the novel, and, for that reason, form opinions which are hectic and unfair. A Press which wishes to interest the public naturally fastens upon the unusual as "good copy," while the novelist, of course, draws upon his imagination, for the convenience of his story. The reader, unless he is well informed as to the normal, is apt to forget that in both daily Press and by writers of fiction he is usually offered the abnormal, and should remember this in shaping his estimate of an institution so comprehensive of all sorts and conditions of men as is the Church in this land.

A number of people grow to think of the Church as simply existing to provide centres of prayer and preaching as a form of spiritual recreation to which a certain proportion of the public are addicted. If that proportion does not amount to a preconceived notion of what it ought to be, the cry is "The Church is failing to attract." If in the great Christian body, variety of view as to ceremonies or matters of faith, not essential to the Christian idea, are frankly and fully discussed, albeit for the most part with courtesy and full recognition of Christian fellowship as to essentials, the Church is described as "torn by dissension." If, since the abolition of Church Rates in 1868, the Church, in order to keep her services and to provide spiritual agencies and the necessary buildings demanded by a population which doubles and redoubles, as well as by the constant decay of ancient buildings, which are really national treasures, she has to plead with constant emphasis for the necessary funds, she is said to be "always begging," "so keen upon money," "so unlike the Master she professes to follow"!

At the present moment such ideas are being sedulously propagated, and with conviction, by people who would probably write themselves down "C. of E."

A lady of high social position wrote to me from Ireland, on returning from a visit to London last year, "I hear on all hands that the Church of England is doomed."

One is familiar with the kind of thing that is readily asserted. Bitter and internecine controversy is said to be gnawing at the vitals of the Church. "The Bishops," we are assured, "are ineffective and lawless, without influence or respect." "The churches are empty."

Over against this kind of talk, it is reassuring to read in a recent publication the impression of one returning from abroad after an absence of many years. "Some people seem to delight in saying that the Church of England is in a state of

decadence; but to one who has seen a good deal of it during the last twelve months as it really is, in country parishes as well as town, it appeared to be throbbing with life and vitality." The writer was one who knew that in reckoning the value and effectiveness of the modern Church, one has to recognize that the greatest part of its work seeks no advertisement and claims no credit. Yet it is sometimes worth while to reckon with what the Church is really doing, and to take stock of that of which the critics of the Church seem unconscious.

The parishes of England number as nearly as possible 13,000, and accepting that number we get some very impressive figures as to what is going on.

It may be assumed that if large and small parishes be reckoned together, an average of ten visits a week are paid by the clergy of each parish to the sick and dying or to those in trouble of some kind or other. This means that sympathy and comfort are brought by the parish clergy to 130,000 homes in this land every week.

Perhaps none but the clergy themselves know how much this is welcomed, and none but the people visited how much it is valued. Is it too much to say that were this continuous service to cease it would be a loss to the national life, for which no sure equivalent could be found?

We hear much about empty churches, but those who have opportunity of knowing would surely agree that the number of people who visit the churches on most Sundays average not less than 200. This gives a quarter of a million people in England who every Sunday worship together and listen to spiritual instruction from those commissioned to give it. That the instruction is sometimes defective, and sometimes little heeded, does not forbid the inference that consciously or unconsciously spiritual ideals and high moral standards keep soaking into the minds of such a large number of people, that the national mentality must gain thereby.

Probably some would say that 200 church-goers for each church each Sunday is a low average. It is a significant fact, known only too well by the clergy, that those who organize great appeals for money for humanitarian purposes usually commence by asking for collections in our "empty churches."

In almost every parish today there is a Church Institute where social work of various kinds is carried on continuously, providing interest and recreation of a healthy kind, and promoting fellowship between all sections of the community. Figures are not available, but it would be extraordinarily interesting to know how many thousand people of this land spend at least one happy evening a week in some Church Institute

or other, and how much each parish gains thereby in fellowship, friendship, and that happiness which comes from mutual help towards a high standard in the social life of the community.

The Parochial Church Council system, established under the Enabling Act, has afforded a great number of lay people the opportunity of interesting themselves in the upkeep of Church life, and the forwarding of the Kingdom of God throughout the population. The average number of people constituting a Parochial Church Council may be assumed to be at least twelve. This means that one hundred and fifty thousand people, most of them in some sort of employment during the day, and tired at the end of it, gather at least once a quarter in the Church Councils. It would be hard to find so large a number of people giving regular service of this kind for any other cause. For this work there can normally be no other motive but the desire for the things for which the Church stands, and one hundred and fifty thousand people in England with this motive represent an impressive body of interest and service.

Much might be said on the subject of Church Maintenance from the financial point of view.

The churchpeople of England have found the greater part of the funds since 1868, not only for the restorations of most of the cathedrals at huge cost, but also for building new churches to keep pace with the rapidly increasing population. The City of Portsmouth furnishes an interesting example of this. Within the last eighty years some twenty new churches have been provided, some of them among the most beautiful modern churches in the country, and the work is still going on, together with provision of parsonage houses and increased stipends for the clergy. The callous indifference which is said to exist towards the Church is scarcely confirmed by this. One may note in passing the impressive fact that each year the voluntary gifts of churchpeople for all good causes approximately amount to nine millions of money, something like two millions in excess of her endowments.

As to the training of young people in the faith and practice of the Church, it is sufficient to note that something like 160,000 voluntary instructors devote themselves to about two million children and adolescents.

Anyone who attempts to visualize the volume of this tide of Church activity flowing onward through the national life year in and year out may indeed wish that greater effects could be demonstrated, but at least it should be plain that in the Church is a living and strong force which must contribute incalculable good to the inner life and the character of the nation.

The "sound and fury" of newspaper and platform con-

trovery, the eccentricities and disloyalties of individuals, the sporadic failures which occur in all great institutions, should not induce anyone to suppose that this vast spiritual organization is tottering to its fall. The work goes on gathering volume every year, adapting itself to the altering conditions of our civilization, with a faith and courage not easily matched elsewhere, and bringing grace, comfort, and consolation to innumerable people who neither know nor care about what we, with the pessimism which is a national characteristic, call "our unhappy divisions."

Many a parish priest, who spends laborious days among his people, lays his newspaper down with a weary smile, reading in it the criticisms and denunciations of some well-assured publicist as to the condition of the Church, and goes forth to his parish duties with quiet thankfulness to meet the warm welcome which he will find in house after house, and street after street, from the countless people who look upon him as their best and most disinterested friend, who will share with them the intimacies of the soul, the difficulties of family circumstance, the problems of young life, the anxieties of finance, and the simple interests of the parish and its church. He is there among them as God's witness and servant, and though they would find it hard to articulate the matter, they love to have it so; all the more because they know that he it is who will serve them in solemn ritual at the great moments of family life, and will stand beside them at the last when they go down into the valley of the shadow of death. It is such men as these with their flocks who form the real *corpus* of the Church of England—and a very great and valuable part of England itself. There is profound satisfaction in the thought that, since that is the case, never in our history has there been in the Church such sincerity and devotion to duty, such fidelity to the Christian Faith, and such diligent self-spending as there is today.

It is, of course, the fact that she is overwhelmed by sheer weight of numbers. It is impossible to cope, in what is essentially individualistic work, with our overgrown population. This has brought it about that the Church can only reach, through her ministry day by day, a fraction of the people, and other religious agencies, however vigorous, are not sufficient to make good her deficiency in man-power and funds.

Yet, by the mercy of God, she is at least able to push on a work, vigorous and effective enough to make it not really true to say of England that it is "pagan." She is steadily maintaining definite Christianity in an incalculable number of lives and homes, and will continue to do so.

NEVILLE PORTSMOUTH.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

DR. LYTTTELTON writes as follows with regard to the late Rev. G. H. Whitaker, whose death was announced a few months ago:

THE REV. CANON G. H. WHITAKER.

A very noteworthy man—a true saint and scholar—has been called to his rest. Eminent even among Senior Classics, he was so humble and self-effacing in disposition that he published very little, and never took part in public movements or in the strife of tongues. His contributions to knowledge were made chiefly in letters to private friends, which consisted of luminous and penetrating comments on the Greek of the New Testament. From the subtlest balancing of meanings he would extract deep and suggestive inferences, touching on the deepest aspect of revelation. Being eighty-three at the time of his death, he was, of course, debarred from much of the “Koiné,” the language of the papyri, but to the end of his life he studied the new “Liddell and Scott,” with references clustered under every word like a quickset hedge. An effort is being made to collect these papers with a view to publishing the most valuable of his suggestions: and our readers will recollect the very important paper on the *Te Deum* printed in THEOLOGY.

But great though he was as a scholar, he was more impressive as a “man of God.” He was a victim of recurrent attacks of a mental malady which sank him into deep depression, and incapacitated him for the time even from the quietest work. He succumbed under one of these at eighty-three years of age, after fulfilling his task as parish priest of a small village near Bletchley, beloved by his little flock, and a gentle witness to the power of the Holy Spirit, the giver of love, joy, and peace. The work in which his rare endowment of holiness and mental power found scope was in his inspiration and renewal of the Clerical Society in his neighbourhood. Patient, gentle, and humble beyond words, he set an example of courtesy, sympathy, and painstaking industry which ought to be known far and wide among our country clergy. Happy are the select few who were able to drink from that fount of Wisdom!

E. L.

A review in a parish magazine of the Right. Hon. H. A. L. Fisher's *Our New Religion* contains the following story, which seems almost too good to be true: “A veterinary surgeon, resident in [this parish] was summoned to attend a cow which had milk fever. He drove over to the farm, and on his arrival at the cow-shed was astonished to find the owner of the animal, an educated woman, sitting on a stool reading to the cow Mrs. Eddy's *Science and Health*.”

Truly in devotion to their faith the children of other religions are sometimes wiser than the children of light!

We fully agree with the letters of Mr. Levertoff and Mr. Rigby printed below, and are obliged to them for the points they make. In reply to the former we should be disposed to justify the terminology we used by

reference to Robertson Smith (*The Religion of the Semites*, p. 6), who writes: "It must be remembered that when modern scholars use the term Semitic, they do not speak as interpreters of Scripture, but include all peoples whose distinctive ethnical characters assign them to the same group with the Hebrews, Syrians, and Arabs." It was in that sense we wrote; but the terminology Mr. Levertoff suggests is, no doubt, more accurate.

The relevance of our article at the present time is sufficiently indicated by some words in one of the summary paragraphs in the *Church Times* of July 11 last, viz.: "Dr. Appasamy points to the existence of two opposing principles of ministry, the priestly and the prophetic, and urges that, if only Anglo-Catholics would recognize the function and power of the prophetic ministry, negotiations would be much easier. This is exactly what Anglo-Catholics are entirely prepared to do." On the contrary, we hope and believe that Anglo-Catholics know their Bible too well to do anything of the kind. The essence of the Scriptural and Catholic position is that the two principles are not "opposing," but complementary; that their complete fusion, as Mr. Rigby points out, is regarded by St. Paul as fundamental to the Church's life; and that the one Catholic Church does, in fact, make provision for both. We admit the difficulty of giving a theological definition of the Nonconformist ministry; but it will certainly not be met by loose and unscholarly phraseology. It may be far better to admit that the problem is insoluble along lines of this kind, and that a much wider net, which will include history as well as theology, needs to be thrown.

CORRESPONDENCE

I

SIR,

Your valuable study, *Apostles and Prophets*, in the July issue of *THEOLOGY*, with the conclusions of which I am in perfect agreement, contains a statement in connection with the origin of Prophecy in Israel which is not in accordance with what we know of primitive Semitic religion.

You say (p. 7): "... the *nebiim* or 'prophets' were a feature of religion common to all the Semitic peoples. They were commonly seen in groups, and a fanatical religious frenzy was one of their chief characteristics." Now there is no evidence for this at all; on the contrary, religious ecstasy is not a Semitic characteristic. You refer to the dancing dervishes, but this ecstatic movement in Islam originated in Persia and developed chiefly there and in India; the purely Arabic "protestant" movement of the Wahabites proves that "mysticism" is not a characteristic of pure Semitic religion. Primitive "prophetism" is probably of Canaanitish origin, and religious ecstasy was a feature of the syncretistic religions of Syria and Asia Minor. The colouring of the picture which Celsus (cf. Origen, *c. Celsum* vii. 9) drew of Christian glossology is actually taken from the native religions of Canaan.

I am, etc.,

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

II

SIR,

Would it not have helped part of your argument to have laid some stress on the fact that in Eph. ii. 20 (τῶν ἀποστόλων κ. προφητῶν) "Apostles" and "Prophets" are coupled under one definite article?—the "Apostles" of the θεμέλιον are also "Prophets," but all Prophets are not Apostles.

A. D. RIGBY.

III

SIR,

I am sorry that by a slip I attributed the phrase "preaching presbyter" to the "Westminster Confession" instead of the "Form of Church Government." Apart from this, Mr. Cromarty Smith objects to my assertion:

(1) That the ruling elder is ordained by laying on of hands, and is entrusted with the administration of the sacraments;

(2) That it is a mistake to suppose that the Presbyterian elder is a layman;

(3) That Presbyterian ordination is not intended to convey grace;

(4) That Dr. Cooper's views have no support in the Presbyterian formularies.

Having no first-hand knowledge of the Presbyterian system, I am obliged to rely on books.

As to (1), Dr. Moffatt (*The Presbyterian Churches*, p. 131) says that elders are ordained; Dr. D. C. Macgregor (*What the Churches Stand For*, p. 107) that they are ordained by the minister only (I am informed that this ordination is by laying on of hands). Dr. Macgregor, an Ex-Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of England, says (*loc. cit.*): "In an emergency the minister may empower a ruling elder to preside at the Communion in his place." Dr. Moffatt (*op. cit.*, p. 126) says that at the Communion the elders receive the elements and distribute them to the people. This is what I meant by "administration of the sacraments" (I should have said "sacrament," if I am right in thinking that only the minister may baptize).

As to (2), I can only say that a man ordained for life (which Dr. Moffatt says is usual), entrusted with the distribution of the elements at Communion, and possessing also the power to admit to or repel from Communion, is not what we mean by a layman, though I admit that the Presbyterians call their elders laymen. (I doubt if the distinction which we draw between "clerici" and "laici" has any exact parallel in the Presbyterian system.)

(3) Dr. Banninga, in the speech at Lausanne to which I referred, and Dr. Fyfe, the representative of the Presbyterian Church of England, stated explicitly that ordination, in their view, does not convey grace, but is the recognition by the Church of grace already given. It was of Presbyterianism in South India, and the Church represented by Dr. Banninga, that I was writing. Dr. Moffatt, I think, says that ordination is not necessary where there is none to ordain: which is natural, if it is only a matter of church order.

(4) Dr. Cooper, if I am not mistaken, held that the Presbyterian Church of Scotland is continuous from the medieval Church, and that all

Presbyterian ministers are Catholic priests. I have never seen any evidence for this view, and it seems to make the history of the Scottish Reformation unintelligible. I should have thought that nothing could be clearer than the intention of the Scottish Reformers to make a clean break with the "Kirk malignant," as John Knox called it, to abolish priesthood, altar, and Mass, name and thing, and to set up instead the "true church of the elect," in which preaching, and not *sacerdotium*, was the distinguishing mark of the ministry.

I am, etc.,

C. B. Moss.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Zeitschrift für die A.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1930. Heft 1.

After a technical article by M. NOTH on five apocryphal Syriac Psalms, which seem to go back to a Hebrew original, J. KAUFMANN contributes a really exciting essay on problems of Israelite history. He attacks the whole Wellhausen conception of the ideal theocracy presupposed by the Priestly Code. It never existed. The original theocracy was seen as a rule of prophets, not of priests. The kingship was idealized when it lay in the past. It is significant that Chronicles begins with Saul, after introductory genealogies, and that the point of view attributed to Samuel in 1 Sam. viii. is wholly absent. Other post-exilic documents show that the ideal was a prince, of David's line. He then examines P, and rebuts the theory of a post-exilic priestly state projected back into Mosaic times. The polity is military rather than priestly, and Aaron is under Moses even in his own sphere. There is no evidence of the law of the one sanctuary. One of many instances to show the priority of P to D is the fact that in D the Feast of Tabernacles has to be observed at the one Sanctuary, in P—in Tabernacles. Kaufmann would not deny later editing, but essentially P is the law of the high places. It has passed into later Judaism through the Synagogues, which are the old high places reformed under the influence of Deuteronomy. This essay will doubtless attract the attention of specialists. It is worth mentioning that Prof. Welch interprets Deut. as the old law of the high places in the Northern Kingdom, so that from two points of view dates are being pressed back. E. KÖNIG discusses Deuteronomy on orthodox critical lines. R. H. PFEIFFER attempts to disentangle an Edomite source in Genesis.

Heft 2-3.

Technical articles on the Armenian Version of Daniel and on the interpretation of Ecclesiasticus are followed by contributions of great interest dealing with the Sabbath. J. MEINHOLD develops his well-known theory that the Sabbath in pre-exilic times was identical with the Full Moon feast. It is generally associated with the New Moon, and the meaning is everywhere appropriate. Such rest as there was, was due to the feast and was consistent with journeys (2 Kings iv. 23) and much lively movement (xi. 5 ff., where the population throngs the Temple on the "Sabbath"). The original Sabbath *rest* was confined to oxen and asses in sowing and reaping times. Nehemiah probably introduced the Sabbath as later understood. K. BUDDE, whose 80th birthday is greeted by the Editor, replies in spirited fashion, laying stress on the fact that

no Full Moon festival is attested anywhere, in the Bible or outside it. N. M. NICOLSKY discusses the Cities of Refuge. They were originally sanctuaries. The Deuteronomic regulations secularized the law. No names of cities are mentioned. Probably Josiah nominated this or that city for a short time. The burden on the city must have been very onerous. The priestly document describes an ideal only, which was never carried out. But the six cities mentioned in Josh. xx. carry on the memory of traditional sanctuaries. A. C. WELCH continues his studies of the part played by N. Israel in the restoration of Temple worship, finding in Ps. xlv. a liturgy of penitence used by a group in N. Israel who worshipped at Jerusalem after the conquest of their country by Assyria.

W. K. L. C.

British Museum Quarterly. Vol. iv., Nos. 3 and 4.

Of outstanding interest in these numbers is the magnificently illustrated article on the Luttrell Psalter and the Bedford Book of Hours. The former, dating from about 1340, will be well known to our readers from the illustrations in Green's *Short History of the English People*. The latter, one of the most beautiful medieval MSS. in existence, dating from the early years of the fifteenth century, was entirely unknown to scholars until it was brought at the end of 1928 for an opinion to the British Museum. There with the Luttrell Psalter it has found at least a temporary home. It is much to be hoped that the British public will hasten to subscribe the £64,500 required to secure these priceless treasures to the Museum and the Nation for all time.

Two other items of great interest, recently acquired by the Museum, must be mentioned—a Syrian axe-head of a date not later than 1800 B.C., therefore belonging roughly to the age of the Hyksos invasion of Egypt; and a bronze buckle from Syria of about the eighth century B.C. Both objects are illustrated and described in these numbers.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xx., No. 4.

Professor Jacob Hoschander, continuing his survey of Biblical (O.T.) Literature, protests against the oft-repeated assertion that many of the laws of Deuteronomy imposed upon the worshippers were demands which could not be carried out after the centralization of sacrificial worship at Jerusalem. "It will be generally granted that the Deuteronomistic ordinances concerning tithes, harvest-festivals, and firstlings, which are specifically singled out to prove this point, were strictly observed by the pious Jews during the second commonwealth. If they had found insurmountable difficulties to comply with them, they would have been modified by the spiritual leaders, and there would be traces of such modifications in the Rabbinic literature in the Tractates dealing with these matters. Surely the conditions of the post-exilic Jews in Palestine were not different from those of the first commonwealth."

Dr. Julius H. Greenstone calls attention to the new Jewish Encyclopædia which is appearing in Germany under the editorship of Dr. Nathan Goldman and Dr. Jacob Klatzkin, *Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Berlin, Verlag Eschkol, vols. i. and ii., 1928; vols. iii. and iv., 1929. A Hebrew edition is also appearing.

Professor Louis Finklestein in an article on Recent Progress in *Jewish Theology*, commenting on Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley's *Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, complains of the absence of any reference to the similarity of the Birkath Na-mazon and the prayers of thanksgiving in the Didache. The similarity is striking and worthy of study; it was pointed out some years ago by Dr. Kaufmann Kohler in the *Jewish Encyclopædia* (vol. iv., article Didache). Dr. Oesterley has, however, called attention to the Jewish character of the thanksgiving (*Jewish Background*, p. 132).

R. D. M.

Anglican Theological Review. Vol. xii., No. 4. 1930.

Herbert H. Gowen investigates the importance of "the name" in folk-lore, primitive and developed religions, and particularly in the Old and New Testaments in order to throw light on the use of the name in Christian Baptism, prayer, and preaching. Thomas L. Harris asks for more positive Christian preaching on "The Spiritual Value of Marriage" instead of mere pulpit denunciations of divorce, and attempts himself to supply that for which he asks. G. Clarence Lund gives an interesting description of "The Modern Liturgical Movement in German Protestantism," and relates how "since the World War German Protestantism addressed itself to the task of composing a Prayer Book." Here there has come a new realization of the importance of cult, resulting from modern psychological research, and a reaction from the pietism of the last century leading to a demand for objectivity in worship. Professors F. Heiler and R. Otto, different though their outlook is, have exercised a profound influence, while the members of the Berneuchener School have contributed booklets with service forms which have been widely used in Germany. The Liturgical Movement in Germany is still in the experimental stage. A. Haire Forster contributes a critical note on "The Meaning of *Δόξα* in the Greek Bible." Norman B. Nash gives a reading course on "Christian Social Ethics." Finally, there are 73 pages of book reviews.

J. O. C.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

In the April number Father Bardy prints fragments attributed to Arius. Their interest lies not so much in the light they throw upon the growth of this heretic's thought as in the witness they bear to an almost unknown aspect of his literary activity. Father De Lager concludes his massive review of the primacy and the metropolitan power of the Archbishop of Bourges during the greatest of all centuries A.D., the thirteenth. He summarizes the addition he has made to our historical knowledge. Father Martin prints the homily "De Pœnitentia" of Severien de Gaba'a. Father Andrieu examines the significance of the laying on of hands in episcopal consecration. Father Chenu prints a hitherto unknown opinion of the worth of the school of Gilbert de la Porrée.

R. H. M.

Die Hochkirche. April.

In an article entitled "The Whole Christ" (*Der ganze Christus*) Professor Heiler gives a comprehensive survey of orthodox Christology, and reviews the work of Christ before and after the Incarnation. The

eternal Christ or Logos is the principle of the whole invisible and visible creation of God. In His redemptive work He is the Light that lighteneth every man, both the Jews under the Old Covenant and the heathen. The Incarnation, Atonement, and Resurrection are facts of salvation, not in the sense of a past event, but of a permanent revelation. Christ lives on in His Church. His living presence is experienced in the pastoral office of the priests and bishops as vicars of Christ, and in the sacraments, especially the Eucharist. Christ lives on also in the individual souls, not only in the saints, but in all suffering men. So Christ is a universal reality, which comprehends time and eternity, heaven and earth.

Theologische Blätter. May.

K. Elliger discusses the question of the antiquity of the belief in Jahwe among the Israelites, and comes to the general conclusion that it is not earlier than the time of Moses. K. Gallig refers to K. Sethe's Amun-studies, in which a similarity is traced between Amun and Jahwe. T. Herrmann explains the terms "Barbarian and Scythian" (Col. iii. 11) as pointing the contrast between black and white, master and slave. Among the books reviewed we notice R. S. Cripps' *Commentary on the Book of Amos*, published by the S.P.C.K.

June.—Dr. H. D. Wendland's inaugural lecture, given at Heidelberg, on "The Christian Conception of the Community," is reported in this number. The community in the sense of the Church is considered as regards its foundation, realization, and aim. Professor H. Barth reviews M. Heidegger's book on *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, and finds in it a serious treatment of the Kantian philosophy. Katherina Krüger gives a report of the fifth conference of the "Union of Evangelical Women Theologians in Germany." Herr B. H. Unruh reviews the *Notbuch* (book of needs) of *Russian Christendom*, a collection of essays, by Professor U. N. Glubokovsky, Dr. I. Iliin, Dr. N. Arseniev, and other German theologians.

July.—The greater part of this number is dedicated to the memory of the great German theologian, Adolf von Harnack. Prof. M. Dibelius delivered the oration at the funeral service in Heidelberg on June 11. It would be impossible to summarize this speech, but it shows clearly the affection and respect which his pupils felt for him. Prof. K. L. Schmidt has collected a number of press notices from all the leading papers of Germany, to which he adds his own appreciation of Harnack's theological work. The writer of these lines would like to record his own pleasant recollections of the lectures which he heard at the University of Berlin, 1908-9. One could not help admiring their stimulating qualities and wide range of learning, even if one was not always in theological agreement with the keen and critical professor. We can at least acknowledge the debt which we owe to his thorough and painstaking scholarship.

L. P.

REVIEW

THE PRIEST'S BOOK OF PRIVATE DEVOTION. Compiled and arranged by J. Oldknow and A. D. Crake. Revised by J. F. Briscoe. Mowbray. 7s. 6d.

It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the first publication of this manual nearly fifty years ago supplied a want which till then had never been supplied in the devotional life of the English clergy. There were, it is true, many excellent books of devotion which the clergy shared with the devout laity, but none which met with the special needs and obligations of their own office. It is this book which has now been revised by the Rector of Bagborough, whose intimate knowledge of the clergy, especially in retreat, has given to him very special qualifications for the task. The revision has been made with thoroughness and care, and the additions have been drawn from original sources of proved value and profit. At the same time it is essentially the same book, and those who have learned to love it in its old form will find in it nearly everything for which they have cared, even though they may not want to add to the original everything which finds a place in the revision.

Priests who are not yet acquainted with the revision may be glad to have some of its features pointed out to them. Over two hundred pages of the book are occupied by the Offices of Prime and Compline with the three lesser Hours, which are made complete by a very careful and thorough "Proper" and "Common" for all the Seasons and Commemorations of the Church. These are followed by divers Litanies, both Latin and English; Preparations for, and Thanksgivings after, Mass; Benedictions of various objects; and certain Forms for ministration to the Sick and Dying. In this section we would call special attention to a very devout "Præparatio brevior ad Missam"; to the Latin Prayers usually ascribed (probably wrongly) to St. Ambrose, with which most priests are familiar; to the Litanies; to the Blessings, which every priest will be glad to have bound up in his book of private devotion; to the Form of Unction of the Sick and the *Commendatio Animæ*, in English, for the Dying; and to the twenty-six Hymns in the original Latin, those for the great Festivals having a Responsory and Collect added to them, making an admirable form of devotion for the respective Festivals. Many of these features are in the book for the first time, and greatly add to its value. We are very glad to hear that the first part of this section, containing the service of the Lesser Hours, which is already familiar to

many under its somewhat strange title of "Prime and Hours," is to be published separately, it is hoped with a preface by the Bishop of Truro.

The second section consists of Forms of Daily Prayer, among which are included the *Salutatio Evangelica* in full both for Eastertide and for the rest of the year; and what should prove a very acceptable set of Devotions for the Third, Sixth, and Ninth Hours "intended for those who have not time" for the hours of the Breviary, though it may perhaps be permissible to question whether those Hours really take very long to say, and whether to those who wish to keep those three times of prayer the preference for these somewhat shorter forms will not be due rather to their less formal nature than to their brevity. But whether that is so or not, these particular Devotions are quite beautiful in their simplicity and directness.

The third section contains personal prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings which will be most valuable for the private use of the priest, both in his own life and in his ministrations "to the sick and whole within his cure."

The fourth section consists of Eucharistic Devotions. It begins with the 1662 Service printed in full with paragraphs of the Latin Canon in English for the private devotion of the priest, and some very full directions and instructions, in the form of rubrics and notes, which will be found of great assistance both to the newly ordained priest and to others, making for a reverent and "unfussy" celebration of the Holy Mysteries. We are very grateful for the printing separately, in full, of the *Canon Missæ* in Latin, fully agreeing with Dr. Nairne, whose words Mr. Briscoe quotes, that it "is the best of prayers (if not indeed the best of all Latin compositions) in its direct unadorned prayerfulness." The section concludes with prayers, thanksgivings, and meditations from various sources.

The three remaining sections—on Confession, Meditation, and for use in sickness—do not need comment. They will be found, with some additions, very much as they were in the original edition.

We are sure that this revised edition of the book only needs to become known to be very widely used, containing, as it does, within its black, sober, "religious-looking" covers, wellnigh all that a priest wants in the practice of his sacred office—Portiforium, Manuale, Ordinale (without the complication of that last-named volume which, under the name of the Pie, the Reformers found it "so hard and intricate a matter to turn")—together with so much for the edification and ordering of his own life without which his public ministry cannot be effectual for the edification of the flock committed to his care.

There is, we think, one serious and most disappointing omission in this revised edition, and that is not Mr. Briscoe's fault. In his short preface he states that "none of the original collects from *The Prayer Book as Proposed in 1928* are included, as permission to reprint them was refused." There may be strong reasons for this action, probably financial, but it seems deplorable that manuals of devotion, whether for clergy or laity, should be deprived of this "enrichment," and that so great an opportunity of familiarizing people with the new Book should be lost. We suppose that it is for the same reason that the additional Proper Prefaces are not included in the Canon. The result is that in places where the Ordinary allows the use of the 1928 Book, the priest is saying one collect and the lay-people have another printed in their books of devotion, drawn from sources less sacrosanct than the Book of 1928. It may be permissible in this connection to quote some words of Dr. Neale in reference to his glorious hymns. After declaring that a hymn, the moment it is published, ought to become the common property of Christendom, and therefore refusing to retain any private right in it whatsoever, he asks "if it has been so cast in (sc. into the treasury of the Church), is not the claiming a vested interest in it something like keeping back part of the price of the land?"

H. V. S. ECK.

NOTICES

A GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK. By J. H. Moulton and W. F. Howard. Vol. II: Accidence and Word-Formation. T. and T. Clark. 30s.

At last this great work of scholarship, delayed by the untimely death of Prof. Moulton in the War, is completed. The first volume of Prolegomena marked an epoch in British scholarship and at once became indispensable to students of the New Testament. The particular feature for which it became famous, namely the brilliant demonstration that supposed Semitisms were really characteristic of spoken Greek in its later Hellenistic phase, has had such influence that the question is now hardly discussed. All the more welcome, therefore, is the long Appendix in the present volume dealing with Semitisms in the New Testament. It occupies 75 pages in which the whole field is covered by means of an exhaustive and methodical discussion. It is difficult to conceive that much advance will ever be made on this as a presentation of facts.

Parts I and II of the present volume, on Sounds and Writing, and Accidence, were published in pamphlet form, in 1919 and 1920, so all that is strictly new, besides the Appendix, is Part III, Word-Formation. The book as a whole is a wonderful monument of exact scholarship, containing a mass of information which philologists in other fields of learning cannot

neglect. The ordinary student of the Greek Testament will feel a little disappointed. The book stops just where he would like it to begin. What he requires is a book which will tell just what difference the new views of grammar make to the understanding of the New Testament. From this point of view Moulton-Howard is less satisfactory than Robertson's Grammar or even than the less ambitious manual grammar of Dana-Mantey, both American books. But for specialists the British book is unrivalled.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

JERUSALEM UND SEIN GELÄNDE. By Gustaf Dalman. M. 22.

Professor Dalman, who is universally acknowledged to be the foremost authority on ancient and modern Palestine, has once more put all students in his debt, through laying before them the fruits of his researches in that field, and so aiding them to a better understanding of the subject. In his *Orte und Wege Jesu*—which, first published in 1919, has already undergone three editions and a French translation, and of which an English translation, by the present writer, with additional notes by the author and translator, is contemplated—Professor Dalman dealt with the Palestine of the time of our Lord, and in particular with the itinerary of Jesus. An intimate knowledge of the country, the languages, Church traditions, and New Testament research, there united to produce a work of unusual variety and most solid erudition.

The present work, which has many illustrations and maps, is specially occupied with the topography of Jerusalem and its environs. The most important factors in the study of the Jerusalem of today are, after all, not the remnants of the old buildings which still stand, or which have been discovered through excavations, but rather the natural features of the country and the relief of the landscape; for these things have not changed, and without them neither the historical character of the Holy City nor the manifold vicissitudes of its past can be rightly comprehended.

For this reason Dalman gives a minute survey of the hills and mountains, of the rivers and valleys, of the roads and paths, in the vicinity of Jerusalem, at the same time discussing numerous problems in connection with localities mentioned in the Bible, and also correcting many errors in books and maps connected with the subject.

The profuse illustrations and the topographical maps with which it is completed add to the value of a work without which no serious student of the Bible and of the history of Jerusalem can afford to remain.

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

WESLEYAN MOVEMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION. By W. J. Warner. Macmillan. 15s.

This work, by an American scholar, is of considerable value in the illumination it affords on the results of religion working on the English culture of the eighteenth century to produce an economic mentality. The work is the result of an extensive research, as is evidenced by the comprehensive list of contemporary sources at the end of the book to which it would be difficult to add. We have only noted one thing, that the life of Dr. Bunting, given as New York, 1859, is incomplete, and has since been superseded by the finished edition. The work is of special value for the emphasis that it places upon Wesley's place in the ethical

development of Methodism, and it also shows the political trends in early Methodism which led to the reactionary policy and ideas that after Wesley's death for so many years dominated the new movement.

The reader will specially note the emphasis that Wesley and others laid on neutrality in politics. "None of us," says the Minutes of Conference, 1792, "shall either in writing or conversation speak lightly or irreverently of the Government under which we live." While Wesley himself was always prepared to speak out, this doctrine became, in the opening years of the nineteenth century, a doctrine of political neutrality in the individual, the inevitable consequence of which was the divorce of Methodism from progressive movements, so that it became practically an adjunct of the dominant Toryism. Even over the slave-trade, which Wesley unhesitatingly denounced as the sum of all villainies, the only remedy he perceived was a personal appeal to the individuals engaged in the traffic or who owned slaves. The use of organized political measures was rejected by him as useless. The result of this unconscious political bias was the development in Methodism of schisms, the formation of new, more progressive branches, which are now once more to come together in a united Church which has long since ceased to regard political neutrality in the individual as a mark of religious life. We believe that at one time, in fact until recently, there was the same tendency among many of the Presbyterians of Ulster.

One of the most interesting sections of the work is the development of Wesley's views on the stewardship of money. Though Wesley did not know it, in this matter he is but repeating in a more modern and complete form the doctrine which in a thousand pages Wyclif laid down in his treatise on *Dominion*. In fact, if Wesley had come across Wyclif's work on that subject he might have taken from it word for word some of his own conclusions.

The book is one of considerable value, the scholarship of which, as displayed by its research, is beyond doubt. But we must confess that the style is not always very attractive.

H. B. WORKMAN.

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS FOR THE NEWLY ORDAINED. By John Dunford.
Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d.

A little book like this is of great interest to Anglicans. On the whole, the similarity of the work of Anglican and Roman clergy in England would seem to be more noteworthy than the difference. The young priest is reminded that over £1,000 has been spent on his education, usually from the gifts of the people. The advice about life in a presbytery is admirable. One is a little surprised to learn that some priests are appointed to a parish immediately on leaving the seminary. The impression is gained that often a priest finds it hard to occupy his time. One god-parent, we learn, is necessary at baptism; "if there is no god-parent you must appoint one." "Churching" seems to be specially valued in England. "Most mothers will not go out for any purpose till they have been 'churched,' as it is often termed." Frequently the priest is asked for wine from the chalice, e.g. for a sick child. He will pour some into the chalice and then into a bottle, for the applicant to take home. The lapse of a large number of young people is partly due to the custom of letting children occupy the time of Mass with hymns, thus

failing to understand its meaning. On entering a sick person's room the priest says, "Pax huic domui," and will probably have to make the response himself. "Usually it takes about half a dozen visits to get a Catholic child from a non-Catholic school." A monotonous voice in reading the Epistle and Gospel is to be avoided. The rubrics of the Mass should be studied periodically; it is easy to slip into bad habits. These are a few interesting details taken from an admirable book. Cardinal Bourne's Allocution to his clergy in 1925 is especially thought-provoking. He recommends many priests to give up the attempt to practise mental prayer in the early morning, and to leave it to the late afternoon or evening. He suggests that such priests should make Prime and Terce, said slowly and if necessary in a sitting posture, the preparation for Mass, and Sext and None the Thanksgiving—before breakfast of course. The working hours that follow will thus be free from the danger of hurried Offices.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

DER PROZESS JESU. By G. Aicher. K. Schroeder. Bonn.

The Trial of our Lord has been the subject of much discussion of late. Jurists have approached it from the standpoint of Roman Law and have misunderstood the niceties of New Testament exegesis. Jews begin with a natural reaction against the age-long attribution of guilt to their race and with a prejudice in favour of the Talmud's being evidence for the first century. Liberal theologians lay stress on the apologetic motive which led the Evangelists, intent on recommending the Gospel to the Roman world, to exonerate the Roman authorities. So it is refreshing to read the present admirable monograph, which comes to conservative conclusions. The author, a Roman Catholic, is far more critical in his methods than one would expect. Indeed, the subject cannot be treated otherwise than critically, since a satisfying harmony of the Passion narratives is impossible. He begins with a list of 126 books dealing with the subject, and most of his monograph is devoted to an exposition of their views. His own conclusion is that both the Sanhedrin and Pilate were responsible. The Sanhedrin tried Jesus as a religious offender. When the question "Art Thou the Christ?" was put, Jesus answered, "Thou hast said." He could not say either yes or no, for there was no common ground between Caiaphas and Him as to the meaning of "the Christ." Had He stopped there, no condemnation would have been possible. He deliberately laid down His life by proceeding to identify Himself with the Danielic Son of Man. Pilate had the *ius gladii*; he could either accept or reject the verdict of the Sanhedrin. He began the case afresh, treating Jesus as a political prisoner. These local "kings" were a grave embarrassment to the governors and had to be treated seriously.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE LIVES OF THE SAINTS. By Alban Butler. A new edition, corrected, amplified and edited by Herbert Thurston, S.J. Vol. II. February. Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd.

One is at first inclined to wonder why a new edition of Butler's *Lives* is thought necessary, but closer examination will cause it to be welcomed. What is primarily a work of reference has now become really readable. Not only has it been brought up to date, but most of the biographies

have been recast. There is little left of the pious verbiage which overweighted the original, and the ponderous platitudes have been replaced by scholarly estimates of the value of legends and traditions. There is no need to refer to the original to notice the change. The Table of Contents indicates which biographies have been added or changed, and to compare the old with the new will not be to deplore the innovations of the present editor. It is not fair to judge the whole work by one volume out of the eventual twelve, but one cannot help being struck by the number of obscure Italians. If this proves to be characteristic of the other months as well, there will probably be various explanations.

The previous edition was a pocket one, with trying print. This is a library edition, and the print is excellent, and each biography has a scholarly and fair-minded note on sources of information.

V. I. RUFFER.

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES IN THEORY AND PRACTICE. By Hans Driesch.
Translated by W. H. Johnston. Allen and Unwin. 7s. 6d.

The first part of this interesting book is concerned with the essential principles of ethics, and the author rightly insists at the outset that "it is only upon a metaphysical foundation that ethical studies become more than a game in æsthetics." Yet when we have finished the book, we are driven to the conclusion that this is just where the author has failed. He gives an acute analysis of the conception of "ought," which seems to have meaning only if the universe be regarded as having a single underlying principle, though he describes it in studiously vague terms. But on p. 87 he suddenly introduces "our fundamental dualist metaphysical view"; this involves the "concept of apology," which is one of the most remarkable features of the book. The standard of what "ought" to be is absolute (and Dr. Driesch has some illuminating remarks on "value"); but there are many acts which ought not to be, yet for which there is an apology, including the action of a doctor inflicting pain for a patient's good. But we seem to be left with a conception of "ought" which has no relation to the actual world; and so our metaphysic becomes not the foundation but the negation of ethics. After this we are hardly surprised to find that Dr. Driesch can write about religion without ever facing the ultimate questions whether God exists, and if so, what is His character.

When the author turns to practical problems, he is chiefly concerned with political matters such as the functions and limitations of the State and the ethics of War. Here there is a great fund of wise thinking, which makes the book of real value to all students of the ethics of public life. There is much in this that will be questioned by readers, but there is nothing that will not repay careful study; and it is an important sign of the times that post-war Germany should be giving to the world so powerful an indictment of the philosophic outlook which leads to the war mentality.

PERCY HARTILL.

SPIRIT IN EVOLUTION: FROM AMCEBA TO SAINT. By H. F. Standing,
D.Sc., Fellow and Lecturer at Woodbrooke College, Birmingham.
George Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to discover whether this book is intended to be a mystical treatise embellished with biological examples

and illustrations, or whether an elementary biological textbook was aimed at, in which case the theological disquisitions would be of the nature of uplift. The book is divided into sections such as reproduction, integration, defence, hunger, etc., but the treatment throughout is of a "romantic" kind, emphasis being placed as much as possible on vitalistic, psychologistic, interpretations of animal structure and behaviour. "What help do we get," asks Dr. Standing on p. 47, "towards the elucidation of living processes by asserting that nothing but physical and chemical forces are concerned?" Any student of scientific method might have informed him that the help is of the profoundest kind, such assertions being the working hypotheses which essentially underlie modern biological thought. But, of course, if Dr. Standing *will* confine his attention to the writings of Dr. J. S. Haldane, he must expect to get a one-sided view of modern biology.

The reader is not encouraged by the technical inaccuracies of the book—*e.g.*, on p. 95 it is stated that "the *ontological* development runs parallel with phylogenetic evolution." Nor does Dr. Standing's book give him any conception of what biologists are doing. Nothing can be better than religion in its place and science in its place, but nothing can be worse than a pudding in which both are mixed together. Dr. Standing would, no doubt, approve of the histologist who looked up from his microscope and remarked that he was thinking God's thoughts after Him, but in the view of many, both philosophers and scientific workers, the proverbial histologist cuts a ridiculous figure.

JOSEPH NEEDHAM.

THE PSALMS, OR THE BOOK OF PRAISES. Herbert H. Gowen, D.D.,
F.R.As.Soc. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

Those (if any) who have hitherto believed that the I.C.C. commentary represents the last word on the Psalter will welcome this book from every point of view. Others will regret that the least satisfactory features of Briggs's work have reappeared in a form in which they are likely to be widely read. For this volume, both in the introduction and in the translation (the transcription mentioned on the title-page does not appear in the book), is little more than a popular statement of Briggs's views. This fact is emphasized by the notes, which occasionally indicate a difference of opinion from Briggs, but apparently ignore the brilliant work done in recent years by such scholars as Kittel, Gressmann, Hans Schmidt, and, above all, Gunkel.

In spite of its critical worthlessness, however, Dr. Gowen's book may be useful and even valuable, if handled in the right way. Allowing for the author's general point of view, his task has been well done. The introduction is clear, and the short account prefixed to each Psalm breathes the right spirit. A definite advance on Briggs is to be seen in the use made of ancient Psalmody outside Israel. The translation should be diligently compared with those of the traditional English Bible and with McFadyen. It is a very great improvement on that of Briggs, for Dr. Gowen has real poetic gifts, and has caught something of the feeling of Hebrew poetry. Even if it does not attain to the standard set by McFadyen (and it is sometimes verbally nearer to the Hebrew) it has something of the rhythm and beauty of expression which mark the original. This is a book which is worth the careful attention of every student of

the Old Testament, and, with the elimination of all that is due to Briggs, may be a real help to the appreciation of the Psalter.

T. H. ROBINSON.

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH IN THE MODERN WORLD. A Study in Scientific Theology. By E. O. James, Ph.D., D.Litt. Mowbray. 7s. 6d.

Dr. James is a recognized expert in anthropology and kindred subjects; he possesses a good general knowledge of the findings of modern science, and the scientific habit of thought, and has kept well abreast of the most important modern work on the Bible, on the problems which gather round primitive Christianity, and on Christian doctrine. His own religious convictions are those of an Anglo-Catholic, but while his outlook could not, in any proper sense, be described as modernist, it is, to borrow the title of an earlier writing of his, very definitely a critical, and not a rigidly conservative Catholicism which he approves. With so much in its favour the present book is, from one point of view, a little disappointing. It is less synthetical than one could wish. The presentations of conclusions of modern scientific thought and of the Catholic orthodoxy which Dr. James expounds and defends are not sufficiently unified, and do not amount to a sustained argument, and the last chapter, which bears almost the same title as the book itself, is not the kind of summing up which one naturally desires. This is not to underrate the good qualities of the book. Its wide information, its candour, and its lucidity give it a real educational value, and both for his own sake and for the sake of the more inquiring minds among his people a parish priest would do well to add it to his library. Moreover, the chapter on "The Saints and the Supernatural," where Dr. James is able to draw on his store of knowledge and his trained judgment in connection with the comparative study of religion, traverses ground which few of us know well, where competent guidance is much needed; though even here I wish that the exposition and criticism of "folk-religion" had been followed by a fuller and more constructive treatment of the meaning and implications of "supernatural personality." In accuracy Dr. James rarely fails, but it is worth noting that not even as the "net result of the Fall" does the ninth article teach that "every person born into the world deserveth God's wrath and damnation"; and while one must admit that here Dr. James is very definitely thinking synthetically, I cannot conceive how any additional knowledge about the nature of physical objects could throw any light on the manner in which "the body born of Mary and crucified on Calvary is present in the Eucharistic species."

J. K. MOZLEY.

POEMS OF EVA GORE-BOOTH. Complete edition. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

Here, in one volume of 600 pages, is no unworthy monument of Eva Gore-Booth which will be treasured by her many friends and will give that wider public, which only knew her by her writings and repute, a not inadequate picture of her vivid personality.

Not only are here all her previously published poems, but thirteen others hitherto unpublished: a self-revealing fragment in prose, "The Inner Life of a Child," and twenty letters to friends written during the last three years of her life (she died in 1926, aged 56). To introduce the volume there is a delightful sketch of her life and character by Miss

Esther Roper, an intimate friend for thirty years, who promises a further book of prose essays, lectures and plays.

Scholar and mystic, lover of nature, books and mankind, social worker and prophet, with a prophet's occasional rebelliousness (was she not the sister of Constance who, as Countess de Markievicz, was imprisoned in the Irish Rebellion of 1916?), Platonist and unconventional Christian, Miss Eva Gore-Booth, by nature and training, found herself sensitive to life at many points, and only able to endure the inequalities, injustices and cruelties of life by her unbroken hold on the "eternal verities." Her bravery of spirit never failed—"One more defeat means but one more attack."

"When Jacob's Ladder reached the skies,
And the earth shone like other stars,
And men were not called great and wise,
Nor had they fashioned prison bars,
And tigers had not learned to slay—
I slept alone in the dark wood,
And when the sun rose every day
I saw why God called His work good."

Yet the very next poem jars by that curious lack of balance and proportion which allows her to couple four names in unequal yoke—

"Joan of Arc and Socrates were slain
By the world's bane,
Jesus Christ a thousand years ago,
They served so,
And Roger Casement, just the other day,
Went the same way."

Miss Gore-Booth had an enormous command of words, and was too often carried away on the stream of her native fluency. The stage direction in one of her pieces, "The white fog begins to flow in at the open door," is only too fatally true of many of her poems.

May one who sincerely admires much of the literary legacy of this unusual writer, and is jealous of her posthumous renown, suggest with all diffidence that a small volume of selections, including all her best short poems, would be a surer means of letting the world know what a rare spirit had been vouchsafed it in these latter days, and of securing the longer life and clearer glow of a fame in danger of disappearance in clouds of its own making?

A. E. SMITH.

DER EPHESEBRIEF DES APOSTELS PAULUS. Von Joseph Schmid.
Herder and Co. Freiburg im Breisgau.

The Epistle to the Ephesians occupies a place of its own in Pauline studies. Few competent scholars nowadays support the Apostle's authorship of the Pastoral Epistles *totidem verbis* with any conviction; those who argue in its favour are on the defensive—their contention is rather, "Why should he not have written them?" rather than, "This is obviously from the Apostle's pen." The other Epistles, except Ephesians, are now secure. But Ephesians occupies a middle position. There is nothing in it that St. Paul could not have written, but the Epistle as a whole gives some the impression of belonging to a slightly later stage than Colossians and Philippians. The impression is never overwhelming, and can easily be altered if the connexion with the Apostle can be stated in a positive rather than negative manner, if instead of saying this is not

un-Pauline we can confidently say this is the Apostle's indubitable manner.

Such being the present state of criticism, Dr Schmid's exhaustive monograph on the conservative side is of great service. He is most open-minded and states all objections to his own views with great fullness and fairness. In England we are not accustomed to books of over 400 pages devoted to prolegomena to one short epistle. Nevertheless, apart from certain long lists of older scholars holding this or that view, there is no padding. The book is very easy to read. The German is simple, the print large, and all relevant passages are given in full in the original. The thoroughness of the treatment may be gauged by the fact that eighty-six pages are devoted to the grammar of the epistle as compared with that of the undoubted Epistles. In fact a young student would probably get a better grounding in New Testament grammar by working through this section than by attempting to study a specialist grammar. The conclusions of Dr Schmid are that Ephesians is a circular letter identical with the Epistle to the Laodiceans of Col. iv. 16; the language tells in favour of its genuineness; the relation of Ephesians to the rest of the Pauline Corpus, here studied in great detail, is decisive for its apostolic origin.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE DESIRE OF GOD IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS.

By James E. O'Mahoney, O.S.F.C. Longmans, Green and Co.
10s. 6d.

Aquinas's doctrine of "the Desire of God" is a fundamental doctrine in his system, and, incidentally, in the *Divina Commedia* of Dante. It is set out in Dr. O'Mahoney's work (see especially pp. 78-98) with ample extracts from the Latin, and it can be summed up under three heads.

(a) "Each thing naturally desires its own perfection" (or) "tends to its own end." (In the various extracts bearing on this head "desire" ("appetitus"), "love," "tendency," and "inclination," with the corresponding verbs, are practically synonyms, as are "perfection," "good," and "end.")

(b) "Natural love (desire), present in all things, is caused by a certain knowledge, which exists, not in the natural things themselves, but in Him by whom nature was instituted." (Thus the desire of a non-rational being is not a *conscious* desire.)

(c) "Each thing (not only loves its own perfection, but) loves God above all things." (Why? Because) "God is the first cause in the order of final causes. . . . He, therefore, rather than any proximate end (*finis*), is the end of each thing"—"the anonymous object of all desire"; (or—from another point of view, because) "by natural love each particular thing loves its own proper good on account of the common good of the whole universe, which is God."

What has all this to do with us to-day? It is an attractive feature of Dr. O'Mahoney's book that it shows in how many ways the Thomist system connects with (and on his view corrects) our "modern" (say post-Kantian) philosophic theories.

Thus (to take a few of Dr. O'Mahoney's examples) Aquinas is not in sympathy with "the voluntarism of Schopenhauer" (or, we may add, with those biologists, or mystics, or adherents of what Ruskin called "the pathetic fallacy," who attribute in greater or less degree some sort of

conscious desire or purpose to natural objects or to nature as a whole). Yet when, as in man, this conscious desire does exist, it is a special merit of Aquinas to show that it does not exist in isolation. It has a metaphysical basis—it is “a necessity of being as such.”

Again, Fichte (and in our own generation, S. Alexander) have familiarized us with the theory of “a God in the making”—of a universe that is not, but is growing to be God. But on the view of Aquinas, “Every being tends to its own perfection because it tends to God, and not conversely.” It is only because God is *actus purus*, the fully realized, pre-existent, final end, that the tendency towards Him is possible. “Nothing potential can have its potentiality actualized except through something that is already actual”; this (according to the article “Thomism” in *E.R.E.*) is the fundamental principle of scholasticism. If true, it endorses the conclusion arrived at by Professor Taylor about “the impossibility of ascribing development to the whole of reality (or) evolution to the universe as a whole” (*Elements of Met.*, p. 273).

Another point. Nature as a whole, though not endowed with mind, *depends* on mind. But the distinction between the mental and the non-mental, between God and nature, is not blurred, as it is in “idealism.” And “the scholastic metaphysics is specially valuable as a corrective to the Kantian substitution of a theory of knowledge for a theory of being (a theory of the objects of our knowledge)” (p. xiv; quoted from A. E. Taylor).

It may seem to us that the scholastic system, though it is obviously subtle, acute, and comprehensive, is not obviously persuasive or even plausible. Dr. O'Mahoney does not aim at writing an introduction to Thomism; but even in books which have that aim, the key conceptions are often treated as though they were self-evident. The suggestion that scholastic logic is not clear and rigid may seem temerarious, but it has some support from scholastic writers themselves. Considerable freedom of, at any rate, interpretation is conspicuous in Cajetan, for instance, and also in the modern writers referred to in Dr. O'Mahoney's book.

It may be that the main principles of the system transcend the arguments used in their support. Mr. Wicksteed says of Aristotle that “he was led by studying the motion of material things to believe in something immaterial and unmoved on which material things depend. His conception of it far transcends anything that his mere inferences from the material world can cover. We find him sharing with Plato an exalted rapture in contemplating the supreme Actuality, presupposed in all potentiality, which shows that he too is a mystic, and which enables us to catch from him something of his own august emotion” (*Dante and Aquinas*, p. 51, condensed). What he says of Aristotle holds *a fortiori* of Aquinas. We may feel—wrongly perhaps—that these main principles express a conviction of the purpose lying behind the universe as a whole and *ipso facto* behind all its parts and processes—a conviction which the argument starts from and elucidates (or perhaps obscures); but does not prove. Yet after all the system, whether it transcends, defies, or is based on argument, is enormously impressive. It excites something much more profound than “the sense of acute intellectual gratification” felt by the logician for the clear and cogent presenting of a case.

Dr. O'Mahoney's fervour is not that of an intellectualist when he writes of “the unexplored grandeur of St. Thomas's theory of matter and form that renders intelligible the return of being to God”; still less is

Dante an intellectualist when at the culminating moment of his vision in Paradise he tells how his "desire and will, finding their true end in God (the unmoved mover), were rolled, even as a wheel that moves smoothly and evenly, by the Love that moves the sun and the other stars."

There is a special problem with which the second half of Dr. O'Mahoney's book is mainly concerned (see p. xv). It consists in "the apparently contradictory way in which St. Thomas has formulated his view" on man's desire for the vision of God: "To see God is beyond the power of any created intelligence"; yet man's desire to see God "is a natural desire"; and "nature does nothing in vain." The problem is unfamiliar to most of us, and the author speaks of Mr. Wicksteed's "Hibbert Lectures" as "one of the very few works in English that has anything to say" of it. We must be content here with this bare statement of its nature, leaving readers of the book to find out for themselves the author's views of its importance and of its solution.

A. D. KELLY.

VERBI MINISTERIUM. By J. E. W. Wallis, D.D. Faith Press. 3s.

Unlike the majority of books on the art of preaching, Canon Wallis' little volume has the merit of being thoroughly practical. The author has perhaps laid himself open to the charge of attempting to cover too much ground in a small space, so that the treatment of some of the subjects dealt with is inclined to be sketchy. But the book abounds in useful hints that are obviously the fruit of experience, and often shows a talent for compressing a good deal into a few words—*e.g.*, an excellent page and a half (pp. 109-10) on the "common limitations of a congregation." Canon Wallis describes his book as written with the special object of helping young preachers: but those who have preached—that most difficult art—for many years will find much to help them too. There is a welcome stress on the fact that preaching is an art and a sermon a work of art, however little likely the ordinary preacher may be to produce anything worthy of that name.

C. S. PHILLIPS.

FACT AND FAITH IN THE BIBLE. By W. R. Williams. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The subject of this book is the inspiration and value of the Bible. It is written for ordinary men and women who have no time nor desire for exact scholarship, who have been disturbed by what they believe to be the challenge of modern discoveries to the truth of the Bible, and who therefore find no use for it in their lives. The author covers in under 200 pages the whole field of enquiry into the validity of both Old and New Testament, and also touches on the important contribution to the understanding of both made by the more recent discoveries of Between-the-Testament Literature.

No originality is claimed. The book gives as a connected whole the development of the life of the People of God from their Call to the writing of the latest Gospel story, showing how the Bible narrative has been written and collected, and what special contribution is made by each book or group of books.

On matters controversial the author wisely in a book of this nature

gives the most generally accepted view without raising the question of alternative views.

It seems probable that for the ordinary reader too much material is compressed into a small compass. For a study circle or a tutorial class the book would be quite excellent as a basis for discussion and further reading. For that reason it needs footnotes, giving the references on which deductions in the text have been based. Its value, too, would be enormously enhanced if each chapter had a list of books for further reading with direct references to the points on which the particular book will throw further light. Suggestions for discussion in Tutorial Classes might also be added in a future edition.

C. R. NEWBY.

THE UNITY OF BODY AND SOUL: THE VALUE OF THE BODY IN CHRISTIAN TEACHING AND MODERN THOUGHT. By F. Townley Lord, D.D. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

This well-informed and thoughtful volume is based upon a thesis presented by the author to the University of London in 1925 as an exercise for the degree of D.D.

It may be said at once that Dr. Lord's treatise is considerably more interesting to the general reader than such productions usually are. With very many of Dr. Lord's contentions, Catholic readers will find themselves in thorough agreement. That the body is an integral and essential ingredient of human nature; that without it the soul cannot function adequately; and that accordingly the human body (in some form or other) will share the soul's eternal destiny of glory—these are truths which are clearly taught or implied in numerous passages of the New Testament, and have behind them the entire weight of Christian tradition. Especially welcome is Dr. Lord's earnest defence, from the standpoint of modern philosophy, psychology, biology, and physical science, of the traditional Christian doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body, as being intrinsically more credible and of greater spiritual worth than the Platonic doctrine of the immortality of the soul alone. This being so, it is to be regretted that his lack of sympathy with all forms of Purgatorial doctrine leads him to favour the theory that the Resurrection takes place, not at the Last Judgment, but at death (p. 234). The ascription of this belief to St. Paul is, from the critical point of view, extremely hazardous, seeing that it contradicts not a few explicit statements in his unquestioned Epistles.

Dr. Lord is, of course, entirely justified in his reiterated insistence that in man soul and body function as *a single organism*, the relations between the two being of the most intimate and penetrating kind.

When, however, he attempts to transcend the duality of soul and body altogether and to adopt the monistic position that the psychical and the physical elements in human natures are merely distinguishable qualities or activities of a single entity, *the organism*, he creates more difficulties than he removes. Of all the distinctions which we recognize in the order of nature, none is so absolute and impassable as the chasm which divides the physical from the psychical. This chasm is not in the least degree bridged, much less abolished, by insisting on the familiar truth that the soul and body coalesce to form a closely knit and harmonious personality. Upon this point the words of Professor Bain, written many

years ago, remain absolutely true to-day: "We are in this fix: mental states and bodily states are utterly contrasted; they cannot be compared; they have nothing in common except the most general of all attributes—degree, and order in time. Extension is but the first of a long series of properties, all present in matter, all absent in mind."

But if mind and matter are thus disparate in their leading qualities, the natural inference is that they are also disparate in their underlying principle or "substance."

Moreover, if the soul is active, as Dr. Lord supposes it to be; if, above all, it possesses the power, after death, of building up round itself a new spiritual body, superior to the body it has laid aside, then it is difficult indeed to deny to it a distinct subsistence of its own. If it thus animates, and in a sense creates, two absolutely distinct and successive bodies, then it seems impossible to deny it a "substantial" and continuous existence, distinct from the being of both. Dr. Lord claims for his "monistic" or "unitary" conception of human nature the support of modern psychology. His right to do this is questionable. Two of the chief points, which practically all varieties of "the New Psychology" (except Behaviourism) agree in emphasizing, are these: (1) that psychical energy is distinct in nature from physical energy and capable of directing and controlling it; and (2) that it is "telic" or "hormic"—i.e., directed towards useful biological ends. This does not, of course, demonstrate, but it certainly suggests, that the two forms of energy are rooted in two distinct principles.

CHARLES HARRIS.

QOHAELAETH: A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES. By Hugo Odeberg, B.D., Th.L., Ph.D. Almquist and Wiksells, Upsala and Stockholm. Kr. 2.50.

This is an admirable little book, arranged in the unusual order: commentary, introduction, translation, bibliography. The author has made an exhaustive study of his predecessors, and has not merely absorbed all that they have said on the subject, but has used his material with caution, judgement, and discretion. He rarely offers a suggestion of his own in textual criticism or exegesis, but his choice and preference as between alternatives is generally careful and sane.

The most important feature of the work is an attempt to discover the real theory and purpose of Ecclesiastes. Dr. Odeberg believes that it is a contrast between the ordinary life of the common man—the life "under the sun"—and the "better life" of the wise man, which consists in "attachment to God, freedom from harassing anxieties, and enjoyment of real joy and wisdom" (p. 95). The Epicureanism of the book is merely superficial, and does not represent the writer's true position. Rather he bids his followers take what good things life has to offer with calmness and detachment, letting the things of the moment pass him by as immaterial and unworthy to influence the wise man. There is a hint of the Stoic *ataraxia*, but the real teaching of the Preacher is so unique as to be wholly expressible only in his own words.

Dr. Odeberg confesses a debt to Canon G. H. Box, but the work is mainly his own. His English is extraordinarily good, and, apart from a few slips in idiom and a few misprints, the reader would never suspect that it had a foreign source.

T. H. ROBINSON.

CONCRETE. By Ælfrida Tillyard. Hutchinson. 7s. 6d.

A novel depicting life 200 years hence. After a proletarian world-revolution in 1951 belief in God has been extirpated from the world, surviving only in an island of the Pacific, cut off from observation by a cloud of smoke, in which dwells a colony descended from a band of Cambridge clergymen who fled there to preserve the faith. (The Roman Catholics were martyred!) A woman finds in Suffolk a Book of Common Prayer, and is threatened with death for reciting Mattins. She and her husband escape in an aeroplane and by accident strike the island. There a community of 500 people have preserved the institutions of their forefathers—Church and Dissent, a Master of Trinity, a Fitzwilliam Museum, etc. The opening chapters are excellent. A world is depicted in which everyone has all he wants (an improbable development) and utter boredom prevails. The population is falling and the negroes alone seem likely to survive. As a religious novel the book is disappointing. A religious interest does not flourish amidst sensational improbabilities. One cannot take seriously the fortunes of a cult against which the gates of hell have prevailed, or of a world from which the overruling Providence of God has been removed. They bear no relation to any Church or world we know.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE CASE FOR VOLUNTARY CLERGY. By Roland Allen. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 8s. 6d.

This is a very serious and earnest plea for a revolutionary change in the matter of Ordination to the sacred Ministry. Basing himself upon modern experience and upon the practice of the earliest Christian community, Mr. Allen boldly presents the case for the ordination of "voluntary clergy"—that is to say, of men who continue after ordination to follow their secular avocations. He endeavours to show that especially in colonial Churches and in the Mission Field the employment of none but stipendiary clergy hinders and hampers the spread of the Gospel and the proper building up of the Body of Christ.

It is not apparent that any well-grounded objections in principle can be urged against Mr. Allen's contention. Nevertheless it would need great courage on the part of the Episcopate to introduce the voluntary system even in new or comparatively new Churches in view of the practical difficulties involved in the disturbance of the long tradition which has prevailed for so many centuries in this matter. As regards old countries, the difficulties would be, of course, much increased. For instance, to omit other matters, Mr. Allen is perhaps a little optimistic in thinking that it would be at all easy to find a due supply of lay persons fit to exercise the priestly office under such conditions as he contemplates. It seems doubtful, to say the least, whether there are many men belonging, for example, to the medical or legal professions who, even if they had the will, could spare the time to perform conscientiously even the essential spiritual duties of the priesthood. It would furthermore require a very considerable change both of heart and habit in the members of an average congregation to accept quite readily as a pastor on Sundays one whom they knew during the rest of the week as possibly a commercial rival or with whom they had ordinary professional dealings. The voluntary system would also involve great changes in the legal position of the clergy in this country in the

matters of preferment, patronage and the like. These and suchlike difficulties may appear very easy to overcome on paper, but they would have to be very carefully considered by anyone in a position of responsibility who might advocate a change on Mr. Allen's lines.

In the new countries, where conditions are somewhat different and tradition and vested interests are not by any means so firmly rooted in the lives of the people, the time may well come when some such experiment will have to be tried. Mr. Allen's evidence certainly suggests that the present stipendiary system fails to cover the ground in Canada and elsewhere.

This is emphatically a book to be read by all those who have the good of the Church at heart, even if they cannot see their way to endorse in its entirety the scheme advocated by the author.

W. R. V. BRADE.

SOUTH INDIAN SCHEMES. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. S.P.C.K.
Paper cover, 3s. 6d.; cloth, 5s.

In this study of the scheme of Reunion at present before the Church, Dr. Sparrow Simpson has taken the crucial and controversial elements in the proposals and considered them against the background of a number of different theories of the Christian ministry, old and new, traditionalist and modernist. His treatment of the problem is certainly untinged by any suspicion of liberalism. There is no trace of any wistful longing that a way may be found to make the South India proposals acceptable to Anglo-Catholics. The argument marches to its goal in ruthless opposition. The whole movement seems to him to be an attempt to combine the incompatible. "The union of an Episcopal and a non-Episcopal Communion does not convert a minister into a priest. No act of union can make conflicting principles of ministry equivalents." So the guns of Catholic apologetic are trained upon the scheme from every angle.

Needless to say, Dr. Sparrow Simpson's conclusions are in the soundest Catholic tradition, and are based upon a wide range of complicated historical facts. One cannot but respect so sincere a piece of work, but it leaves one wondering whether the writer will succeed in *commending* Catholic principles to the thousands of religious people who feel instinctively that there is something in them of "distinctive religious worth" and yet are unable to see very clearly what that precious something is.

If young churches are to develop healthily they need certain assurances and safeguards. (1) The historic content of the faith needs to be safeguarded from the idiosyncrasies of merely individual apprehensions of it. This cannot be ensured merely by documents, formulæ, or creeds. It needs a continuity of living agents who are commissioned to preserve the whole historic content.

(2) Provision must be made for the continuous shepherding of Christ's sheep, and safeguards laid down against unauthorized ministries, whether of "episcopi vagantes" or others.

(3) If ministers are to be guarded from the dangers of spiritual pride, self-glorification, and reliance on their own gifts, they must be taught that they are quite unimportant so long as the life of the Church goes on, that their unworthiness will not hinder the effect of the Sacrament, that Christ in ordaining them through the laying on of hands of His appointed minister in ordination will give them a *χαρακτήρ* which will make them

in the exercise of their office more than themselves because they are channels of His grace.

(4) There is that in spiritual authority which is quite other than the authority of a majority, however inspired. It is more transcendent and more universal. The bishop as the instrument of Christ's spiritual authority represents those elements in it.

Are not these principles as vital to the building of the Church as ever they were? And is it not the doctrine of Apostolic Succession which has been the symbol which has safeguarded them?

E. R. MORGAN.

THE EARLY TRACTARIANS AND THE EASTERN CHURCH. By P. E. Shaw.
Mowbray and Co. 6s. 6d.

This work serves a double purpose: it records the various attempts made by Tractarians to approach the Eastern Church, and incidentally shows us the distance we have travelled since 1840 in the cause of re-union. The Tractarians had a strong desire for unity, but when they looked abroad the approach towards Rome seemed blocked by doctrinal differences. The East seemed to offer brighter prospects; but as negotiations proceeded, always informal, they were disappointed to find how much they were misunderstood. There was ignorance on both sides. After the Council of Florence the Eastern Churches seem to have been forgotten in England. This is not surprising, for until the formation of the Levant Trading Company in 1579, there was very little intercourse between England and the East. If we knew nothing of the Orthodox, they knew less of us. Bishop Jewell in his *Defence of the Apology* wrote: "What the Grecians this day think of us I cannot tell." Happily all this is changed to-day. The author gives a full account of the efforts of William Palmer of Magdalen College, who tried to persuade the Russian Church to acknowledge his Orders and receive him to communion. The cause of refusal is to be found in the fact that the Russians saw that Palmer had no sort of official support. The most interesting chapter in this work is that on the Jerusalem Bishopric. Dr. Liddon was the vehement opponent of this measure, and Newman said it was one of the three blows which broke him in the autumn of 1841. This should be read in conjunction with chap. iv., vol. ii. in the *Life of Archbishop Benson*. For there we are told what great pains Benson took to prevent a repetition of the mistakes of Bishop Gobat. It was the Archbishop's wise directions given to Dr. Blyth, his nominee, which did much to restore the confidence of the Orthodox and led the way to the present happy relations which now exist between ourselves and the whole Eastern Church. But the crisis did good, inasmuch as it cleared the air and prevented a repetition of the scandal of proselytism which prevailed in the early days of the Joint-Bishopric. The writer records the interest of S.P.C.K. in the Eastern Church, when the Society despatched Ainsworth and Rassam to enquire into the state of the Assyrian Christians of Kurdistan. The result of this was the mission of Dr. Badger to Mosul in 1842, bearing a friendly letter, drawn up by Archbishop Howley, addressed to the Patriarchs and Prelates of the Eastern Churches to explain his action in sending help to the Assyrian Church.

F. N. HEAZELL.